

Nikolai Sibilev

---

# The Socialist International



Progress Publishers  
Moscow

Translated from the Russian by *Nadezhda Burova*  
Designed by *Vadim Novikov*

Николай Сибилев  
СОЦИАЛИСТИЧЕСКИЙ ИНТЕРНАЦИОНАЛ  
*На английском языке*

© «Международные отношения», 1980  
English translation © Progress Publishers 1984  
*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

С 0801000000-531  
014(01)-83 — 46-84

## CONTENTS

Foreword . . . . .	5
CHAPTER ONE. The Foundation of the Socialist International . . . . .	9
CHAPTER TWO. The Socialist International's Policy Goals . . . . .	31
1. The Programme of the Socialist International . . . . .	31
2. Discussion on the Problems of Democratic Socialism . . . . .	49
3. The Ideological Activity of the Socialist International and its Member Parties in the 1970s . . . . .	67
CHAPTER THREE. The Foreign Policy of the Socialist International . . . . .	93
CHAPTER FOUR. The Socialist International and the National Liberation Movement . . . . .	159
1. The 1950s . . . . .	159
2. The 1960s . . . . .	172
3. The 1970s . . . . .	189
CHAPTER FIVE. The Socialist International and the Unity of the Workers' Movement . . . . .	222
1. The Socialist International's Approach to the Co-operation of Workers' Parties . . . . .	222
2. The Two Conflicting Tendencies in the Socialist International . . . . .	237
3. Difficulties for Achieving Unity of Action and the Communist Policy on the Issue . . . . .	251
Conclusion . . . . .	270
Supplement. The Socialist International and the Present Day: the Momechorn Congress . . . . .	278

## FOREWORD

Mankind is now going through a complicated and controversial period of social development, one of acute struggle between forces of opposed social and political orientation.

This historic struggle involves various political parties, public organisations and movements, including social-democracy, its national and international organisations and, above all, the Socialist International.

Today, the Social-Democrats constitute a sizeable contingent of the working-class and democratic movement in the capitalist world. The influence of the Socialists and Social-Democrats is greatest in the advanced capitalist countries of Western Europe. In 1980, they either had seats in or formed the governments of twenty countries, including the FRG and France, Western Europe's two largest countries.

What is the role played by social-democracy in the world today?

In our day social-democracy is a highly heterogeneous movement involving parties and organisations operating in various developed and developing countries and taking different stands on the many important problems of social development. Even parties in the same region, such as Western Europe, manifest essentially varying attitudes to capitalism and existing socialism, to the national liberation and communist movements, to the principal tasks of the working-class movement and to world developments.

Social-democracy incorporates two groups of parties belonging to the Socialist International: those described as "socialist" tend

to take a more leftist stand on certain ideological and political problems than those referred to as "social-democratic".

It should be pointed out, however, that that which unites these parties is more important than that which divides them. The important thing is that all of them adhere to reformist concepts of the working-class movement and support the doctrine of "democratic socialism" as formulated in the Socialist International programme of 1951. This accounts for their close co-operation both within the framework of the Socialist International and outside it. For all the differences in the positions taken by individual parties, classified by some scholars as "socialist" and "social-democratic", the author maintains that there is no ground, at least at the present-day stage, for separating them. He regards the socialist and social-democratic parties incorporated in the Socialist International as parties of the same type, ones taking a more or less similar posture in the ideological and political struggles unfolding in both individual countries and the world arena. Therefore, in this book the terms "socialist party" and "social-democratic party" as well as "reformist workers' party" and "social-reformist party" are used interchangeably.

The author's primary task is to outline the most significant tendencies in the development of modern social-democracy, the most general trends in its ideology and policies. This calls for a study of the history, ideology and policy of the Socialist International as the main international organisation of the Social-Democrats, which unites the overwhelming majority of the socialist and social-democratic parties of the world.

The history, ideology and policy of the Socialist International is to a large degree the history, ideology and policy of the entire international social-democratic movement. However, they do not fully coincide. The Socialist International is a specific organisation with its own peculiarities and its own goals. At the same time, it is important to emphasise that the history of the Socialist International reflects the most general and essential tendencies in the development of the social-democratic movement today.

An extensive historical analysis of the Socialist International's activities makes it possible to trace the shaping of the common stand of the international social-democratic movement on the

most important issues of its ideology and policy, to examine the activity of the international social-democratic movement today and forecast possible tendencies in its future development and also provides a better understanding of the distinguishing features of individual social-democratic parties, their stands on various problems and the place they occupy in the social-democratic and working-class movements. The parties' postures and opinions sometimes clash at the Socialist International's various forums, and an analysis of them is essential for the different tendencies in the international social-democratic movement to be correctly assessed and for a specific approach to individual social-democratic parties and organisations to be elaborated.

The author examines a rather extensive period stretching from the end of World War II to the early 1980s. Although a study of the activity of the Social-Democrats over such a long period of recent history is bound to encounter certain difficulty, it makes it possible to analyse the evolution of the Socialist International's positions in full scope and give a more objective assessment of its main results.

In studying the essential aspects of the Socialist International's activity, the author takes into account the extremely contradictory, inconsistent character of its ideology and policy. On the one hand, the views and ideas advocated by the Socialist International are of a petty-bourgeois nature and objectively contribute to perpetuating capitalism and bourgeois domination; on the other, they reflect the interests of the working people, their desire to eliminate oppression and exploitation and put an end to the sway of the bourgeoisie. The book's aim, as the author sees it, is to expose the theoretical groundlessness and political harm of some of the important aspects in the theory and practice of the Socialist International and its member parties as well as to single out those positions of the Social-Democrats which are in harmony with the interests of the working people and create objective prerequisites for co-operation among Communists, Socialists and all left-wing democratic forces.

Criticising some of the positions and actions of the Socialist International and its parties, the author stresses that the bourgeoisie and monopoly capital, as well as the entire system of state-monopoly capitalism designed to safeguard their interests, remain the chief adversaries of the working people, against which a con-



sistent ideological, political and economic struggle should be waged. The success of the struggle can be ensured by the unity of all democratic, anti-monopoly forces, above all, those of the working class and its parties.

The unity of actions of the working class, co-operation between all its organisations and movements, especially between the Socialists and Communists is a pivotal issue of the present-day working-class movement. This issue has invariably been given priority by the Communists.

The Final Document adopted by the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties stressed: "Communists, who attribute decisive importance to working-class unity, are in favour of co-operation with the Socialists and Social-Democrats to establish an advanced democratic regime today and to build a socialist society in the future. They will do everything they can to carry out this co-operation."<sup>1</sup>

While aiming to outline the overall picture of the activity of the Socialist International, the author is conscious of the fact that it is impossible to give an exhaustive answer to all questions related to the subject in one, comparatively small book. Nonetheless, the book gives an idea of the main stages in the evolution of the Socialist International, the essence of its ideology and policy, and its development outlook.

<sup>1</sup> *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969, p. 24.

## Chapter One

# THE FOUNDATION OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

The Socialist International is the successor of the Labour and Socialist International of the pre-World War II period, which resulted from the 1923 merger of the Second International and the so-called "two-and-a-half" International and united West European socialist and social-democratic parties taking social-reformist positions.

The Labour and Socialist International ceased to exist in early 1940, when Nazi Germany occupied Brussels, the International's headquarters. Although the leaders of various European social-democratic parties, who had emigrated to Britain and Sweden, formed various organisations and tried to maintain contacts and co-operation among them, their organisations had neither sufficient authority nor plenary powers to represent the international social-democratic movement.

At the end of World War II, the leaders of the British Labour Party and some other European social-democratic parties took steps to revive the Socialist International. Yet, it was not actually revived until six years after the war.

The delay in the Socialist International's re-establishment was due to the unfavourable situation in the early postwar years. The main reason behind it was that many Social-Democrats, whom the war had taught a bitter lesson, began to realise that any split in the ranks of the working class was detrimental to its cause and that it was vital to unite all workers, first of all Socialists and Communists, into a monolithic class force. These sentiments induced social-democratic leaders to unequivocally acknowledge the neces-

sity of united actions on the part of all the contingents in the working-class movement.

For instance, in 1945 Léon Blum, the leader of the French Socialists, said that Socialists' and Communists' fraternal unity and combined sacrifices in a joint struggle made it clear to both of them that their ultimate goal was of a common character—social transformation.

The necessity of working-class unity was recognised by other leaders of West European socialist parties as well. A document entitled *International Labour Unity* declared that only sincere co-operation among the workers of all countries would ensure peace and progress. Everything that could promote the unity of progressive forces on a national scale and foster co-operation among workers and progressive forces throughout the world was acclaimed. The document was signed by such prominent figures in social-democracy as the Chairman of the prewar Labour and Socialist International, Louis de Brouckère, the Austrian Socialists Karl Czernetz, Julius Braunthal and Oscar Pollak, the British Labourites Harold Laski and James Griffiths, the German Social-Democrats Hans-Jochen Vogel and Erich Ollenhauer, and the Italian Socialist leaders Pietro Nenni and Giuseppe Saragat.

The Socialists attending the London Conference of March 1945 stressed the necessity of working-class unity.

The establishment of the World Federation of Trade Unions, a united international trade-union organisation (September 1945), reflected the striving for uniting the working-class movement and the new opportunities for joint action by Communists and Socialists. For the first time since the split of the international working-class movement during World War I into two opposing trends—the revolutionary and the reformist ones—trade unions of various countries and differing political orientation united into a single organisation. This gave rise to hopes among workers that it was feasible to set up a single international organisation to unite working-class political parties, the more so, since the Communists and Socialists in many European countries co-operated successfully not only in trade unions, but also in local and national organs of state power, parliaments and governments.

However, as subsequent developments were to prove, many social-democratic leaders, despite their pronouncements on the

need for cohesion, actually made efforts to maintain the split in the working-class movement. The policy pursued by the leadership of the British Labour Party was especially illustrative in this respect. British scholars William Paterson and Ian Campbell noted: "After 1945 British involvement with continental social-democracy was mainly directed at preventing too close co-operation with the communists."<sup>1</sup> After the war, in a bid to hamper co-operation between Socialists and Communists, right-wing leaders of the Labour Party and of some social-democratic parties worked to restore the Socialist International at an early date, in order to use it to retard rapprochement and co-operation between the socialist and the communist parties and dislodge from the Communists those social-democratic parties (primarily East European ones) which largely acted in unity with communist parties.

The issues were discussed at the September 1944 Conference of the Socialist Parties of the British Empire, at the 43rd and 44th annual conferences of the British Labour Party held in December 1944 and May 1945, respectively, and at a special conference held in March 1945 to consider the establishment of an international organisation of social-democratic parties.

The discussions resulted in a decision to reconstitute the Socialist International through the efforts of an ad hoc commission.

The restoration of the Socialist International was the main topic of discussion at the first postwar official International Socialist Conference held in May 1946 in Clacton, Great Britain, and attended by the representatives of 19 parties. The Conference revealed that social-democratic parties were not unanimous on the issue. Many Socialists did in fact consider it essential to set up a united organisation of all workers' parties, a truly worldwide International, uniting both socialist and communist parties. The proposal, advanced by the representatives of the East European social-democratic parties, was supported by the leader of the Italian Socialist Party Pietro Nenni and by some members of the French and Belgian delegations.

Failing to gain the support of the majority of the participants, the proposal was turned down. Many of the social-democrats

<sup>1</sup> William E. Paterson and Ian Campbell, *Social Democracy in Post-War Europe*, The Macmillan Press Ltd., London, 1974, p. 11.

deemed it neither necessary nor possible to set up a single organisation of the kind proposed, what with the serious differences in the ideology and policy of the social-democratic parties, on the one hand, and the communist parties, on the other. Whatever the approach, in those days Socialists by and large subscribed to the view that a new International should not be conceived as an anti-communist organisation, but should instead seek co-operation with the communist parties and the Soviet Union. These sentiments were reflected in the first draft statutes of the Socialist International, which was prepared in early 1946 and included a special clause on co-operation between Socialists and Communists.

Anti-communist tendencies, however, started to manifest themselves in the attitudes of some social-democratic leaders, especially those in the right wing of the Labour Party.

The Socialists could not openly proclaim an anti-Soviet, anti-communist policy in the early postwar years since the lessons of World War II were still fresh in everyone's minds, and the peoples of Europe and the whole world were deeply grateful to the Soviet Union for having saved mankind from the Nazi tyranny. The broad masses had great confidence in the Communists, who fought in the forefront of the battle for the freedom and independence of peoples. The masses displayed strong revolutionary sentiments and demanded radical change, the removal of reactionary forces from the positions of power and greater unity of Socialists and Communists in the struggle for the working people's vital interests. In this context, even the right-wing leaders of the Labour Party could not but take into account the stand of those Socialists who advocated the unity of the working-class movement and co-operation with the Communists.

Due to the discord over the nature of the International to be formed, the delegates of the First International Socialist Conference failed to work out a common stand. Yet, the resolution they adopted stressed their determination to reconstitute the Socialist International and, to this end, a special committee was established, headed by Camille Huysmans, the last Chairman of the prewar Labour and Socialist International, to devise recommendations for the next conference of socialist parties. All parties were invited to give suggestions on how the international socialist organisation should be restored and on its principles,

structure and main goals. The Clacton Conference set up a permanent body of international socialist conferences, the Socialist Information and Liaison Office headed by the Secretary of the International Department of the British Labour Party, Denis Healey. The conference was, to quote the Secretary of the Labour Party Executive Committee, Saul Rose, "the first step towards the reconstitution of the Socialist International".<sup>1</sup> It is also significant that the Socialist Information and Liaison Office was housed in the headquarters of the British Labour Party and until January 1947 financed by the Party.<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, the Clacton Conference decided that only one party from each country would have the right to participate in the international socialist conferences and that various organisations of social-democratic war émigrés would not be allowed to participate. This was a measure designed to overcome discord within the social-democratic movements in certain countries, to unite various socialist groups and trends in monolithic parties which would be able to retain dominant positions in the working-class movements and political affairs of their countries.

Thus, although the First International Socialist Conference failed to solve the problem of reconstituting the Socialist International, it still had an important role to play in consolidating co-operation among the social-democratic parties.

The problem of reconstituting the Socialist International was again discussed at the Second International Socialist Conference in Bornemouth, Great Britain, in November 1946. Once again the aim was not achieved yet, and the International Socialist Consultative Committee was established whose membership was open to the representatives of all parties participating in socialist conferences. At the same time, the statements made at the conference on reconstituting the Socialist International differed significantly from those made at the previous conference, when the Social-Democrats voiced their desire to re-establish the International as soon as possible and even set up an ad hoc committee to this end. At the second conference, as was reported by

<sup>1</sup> Saul Rose, *The Socialist International*. A Labour Party Publication, London, 1955, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> See: *Yearbook of the International Socialist Labour Movement, 1956-1957* (hereafter referred to as *Yearbook*, 1956). Ed. by Julius Braunthal, Lincoln-Praeger International Yearbook, London, 1956, p. 32.

the Executive Committee of the British Labour Party, all parties were of the opinion that "the establishment of a formal Socialist International is not possible at the moment".<sup>1</sup>

What are the reasons for such an about-face in the positions of the social-democratic parties?

The controversy and internal strife in the European social-democratic parties exacerbated under the impact of world developments made them incapable of elaborating a common stand on various problems of theory and tactics, including the character, tasks and policy of the Socialist International.

Deepening revolutionary transformations in East European countries, the growth of national liberation movements in Asian and African countries, and the upsurge in the workers' and democratic movements in the developed capitalist countries, above all in Western Europe, gave rise to the growing uneasiness of the ruling classes in capitalist countries, making them apprehensive of losing their privileges and power and concerned over the fate of capitalism itself. Right-wing, conservative circles in the United States and West European countries launched a series of measures to retard the growth of peoples' revolutionary and liberation struggles, to hamper the strengthening of revolutionary-democratic regimes in Europe and to undermine the international prestige of the Soviet Union. The activity of West European powers started to display growing anti-Soviet and anti-communist tendencies. This posture of the imperialist forces was unequivocally formulated in Winston Churchill's Fulton speech of March 1946.

The posture taken by the ruling classes in Western countries had a serious influence upon European social-democracy: controversies over paramount ideological issues and problems of domestic and foreign policies grew ever more intensive within social-democratic ranks. The leaders of West European social-democracy, infected by anti-communist sentiments, began to overtly support the policy of the imperialist forces of the United States and West European countries. By contrast, the left Socialists, especially those in the countries of Central and Southeast Euro-

<sup>1</sup> *The Labour Party. Report of the 46th Annual Conference Held in the Winter Gardens, Margate, May 26th to May 30th, 1947, London, 1947, p. 18.*

pe, became increasingly determined in pursuing a course towards revolutionary transformations, towards alliance with the Communists and support of Soviet foreign policy. It turned out that in this context it was impossible to elaborate common ideological and political positions which could unite all European social-democratic parties in a Socialist International.

The year 1947 was marked by a further aggravation of international tensions and the beginning of a cold war unleashed by US imperialists. On March 12, 1947, the Truman Doctrine, the bedrock of the US anti-Soviet course, was proclaimed. On June 5, 1947, the Marshall Plan, designed to assert US domination in Europe and provide assistance to the bourgeoisie of the European capitalist countries, was made known to the public. Simultaneously, a broad campaign to intimidate the masses with alleged "Soviet aggression" and a "communist revolution" was launched in the Western press.

Amidst growing confrontation in the world, above all in Europe, and under pressure of American imperialists and bourgeoisie in their own countries, the leaders of West European social-democracy started to refrain from co-operation with communist parties and facilitated the exclusion of Communists from governments in capitalist countries.

The idea of the "third force" advanced in November 1947 by Léon Blum, the leader of the French Socialists, was used to justify this policy. The proponents of the "third force" concept claimed that it was no longer possible to continue the policy of uniting all left forces, above all the Socialists and the Communists, because this supposedly led to the exacerbation of contradictions and social strife and was bound—due to the "maximalist" demands advanced by the Communists—to result in a civil war, disaster and suffering. Therefore, Léon Blum and other advocates of the "third force" concept maintained that their task was to set up a new bloc of political forces in capitalist countries which, headed by the socialist parties, would be a buffer between the right and the Communists and to ensure the peaceful, democratic development of states. The "third-force" advocates declared further that their task was to fight on two fronts—against the right and the left. However, as further developments proved, the "third force" concept was employed by right Socialists to discontinue co-operation with the Commu-

ists and align with the bourgeois forces in the struggle against Communists.

The left forces in the working-class movement opposed these efforts by the right Socialists. The European socialist parties were plagued by intensifying contradictions that entailed a further polarisation of forces and aggravated infighting.

It was in this setting that in November 1947 the Socialists convened their conference in Antwerp. The conference faced a complicated task: to chart a common policy for the socialist parties vis-à-vis the essential international problems, including the Marshall Plan and attitudes to the communist parties and the Soviet Union. The representatives of the 18 socialist parties took pains to work out a statement on a common political platform but the task proved to be extremely toilsome due to serious differences among parties.

Irreconcilable differences were revealed on the issue of what position to take towards the Communists and the Soviet Union. Socialists from Central and Southeast Europe, knowing what the horrors of war and the Nazi occupation were all about, were well aware of the need for an alliance with the Communists to steer the development of their countries along a new, socialist road. They realised that the independent and democratic development of their nations could be ensured only through a close alliance with the USSR. The leaders of West European socialist parties embarked on quite a different policy—that of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism despite the dire lessons of the war and their own pronouncements made not long before on the need for uniting the international workers' movement. This was expressed at the Conference in a most explicit form by Voring, leader of the Dutch Labour Party. He said, among other things, that it was useless to search for a compromise with representatives of socialist parties from countries of people's democracy, since the latter were allegedly terrorised and enslaved by the Communists, and, therefore, restrained in their actions. The West's policy, he added, was grounded on the Marshall Plan and struggle against communism.

West and East European Socialists also differed on the Marshall Plan. While the socialist parties of Western Europe supported the plan, the Socialists from the countries of people's democracy rejected it. This is understandable, as they simply could

not uphold the American imperialists' plan, which was designed, among other things, to support the European bourgeoisie in its struggle against socialism and the working-class movement. The controversy over the Marshall Plan was so decisive at the conference that opposite opinions had to be recorded.

The problem of reconstituting the Socialist International also stirred serious controversy at the conference.

Socialists from France, Belgium and Holland were among the most active supporters of the Socialist International's re-establishment. For example, Max Buset, President of the Belgian Socialist Party, insisted that it was high time to re-establish a united international socialist organisation, proceeding from the vital necessity to unite the socialist forces under its banner and make it instrumental in consolidating the Socialists' positions among the masses. The French socialist leaders believed that the International's re-establishment and stronger ties with influential social-democratic parties in other countries might have a considerable influence upon the French electorate and consolidate the Socialists' positions compared with those of the Communists. It is noteworthy that US Socialists were especially active in supporting the revival of the International and, not being official members of the International Socialist Conferences, the American guests urged a complete rupture with communism and insisted on founding a completely new International.

The American proposals were opposed by the Socialists from East European countries and Italy as well as the left Socialists from some other countries who actively co-operated with the Communists. They realised that the revival of the social-democratic parties' International would extend the split in the European and international workers' movement, hamper co-operation between the Socialists and the Communists, and weaken the working class, thereby objectively strengthening the positions of the bourgeoisie and reactionary forces. The Polish Socialists, for instance, stated that an international organisation of any kind could be created only in the form of a joint organisation of Socialists and Communists uniting the entire working class. Yet, in conditions when most of the socialist parties developed right-wing tendencies, an International could be set up only on an anti-communist, anti-Soviet basis. The Socialists from the coun-

tries of people's democracy as well as the Italian Socialist Party regarded it as inconceivable.

As the Social-Democrats recognised themselves, the parties of the two opposing groups could not offer a common platform for the re-establishment of the Socialist International. Eirene White, the then Chairman of the British Labour Party, explained the reasons preventing the restoration of the Socialist International immediately after the war as follows: "In the early post-war years the principal impediment to this lay in the difference of approach between those parties which were prepared to collaborate with Communist parties and those which were not."<sup>1</sup>

The British Labourites and Scandinavian Social-Democrats came out against the official re-establishment of the International on the pretext that it was not the right moment. The fact of the matter was that both the British Labourites and the Scandinavian Social-Democrats were in power at that time and did not want to have their hands tied by decisions of an international body, which could hamper their domestic and foreign policies. Denis Healey, Secretary of the Labour Party International Department at the time, wrote: "When a party becomes a Government it becomes responsible no longer simply to its own members but the country as a whole. It cannot then remain subject to the decisions of a foreign and sectional body."<sup>2</sup>

There were some other considerations, too. The re-establishment of the Socialist International on an anti-communist, anti-Soviet basis would result in severed relations between social-democratic parties in Western Europe, on the one hand, and parties of East European countries, on the other. At that time, however, this was not in the interests of the leaders of the British and Scandinavian Socialists, as they would lose an opportunity to influence the socialist parties in Eastern Europe and through them the development of these countries. They sought, therefore, to maintain their contacts with East European socialist parties and to rely on them for promoting their policies.

As the result of the debates in Antwerp the delegates agreed with a resolution of the commission set up at the previous conference that "present circumstances did not favour the re-establishment of a Socialist International".<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the undertaking was again postponed for an indefinite time.

At the same time, the Antwerp Conference took additional measures aimed at consolidating ties and co-operation among the socialist parties: a new body, the Committee of International Socialist Conference (COMISCO), was established, with all parties represented in it (one representative from each party participating in the Socialist Conferences). The sessions of the Committee were regarded as an important summit of social-democratic leaders possessing plenary powers to make political decisions. Morgan Phillips, General Secretary of the British Labour Party, was elected Chairman of the Committee. The tasks of COMISCO were not confined solely to administration, its functions being primarily of a political character.

\* \* \*

The establishment of COMISCO signified a new stage in the postwar history of European social-democracy. On the whole, its activity reflected the growing anti-Soviet and anti-communist sentiment among West European socialist leaders and an undisguised split in the European social-democratic movement. Neither the socialist parties of the countries of people's democracy nor the Italian Socialist Party took part in the work of COMISCO. It is not accidental, therefore, that the American bourgeois press, while displeased that the Marshall Plan failed to gain unanimous approval at the Antwerp Conference, expressed satisfaction with the rightward shift manifest in the stand taken by the West European Socialists.

One of the principal tasks of the COMISCO leadership at that time consisted in mobilising West European social democratic parties' support for the Marshall Plan. Some of the party leaders, first of all the British Labourites, decided to convene a special conference outside the COMISCO framework to be attended only by the social-democratic parties backing the Marshall Plan. The conference, held on March 21 and 22, 1948, expressed its full approval of the Marshall Plan. It was pointed out that

<sup>1</sup> *The Socialist International. A Short History*, London, 1969, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *The Manchester Guardian*, June 7, 1946, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Report of the Forty-Seventh Annual Conference of the Labour Party, Scarborough, 1948*, Transport House, London, 1948, p. 24.



without this plan Europe would be unable to avoid economic disaster and political disorder. Leaders of the West European social-democracy abandoned their attempts to pursue an independent course, opting for co-operation with the US imperialists and the bourgeoisie in their own countries.

The Marshall Plan stipulated that postwar Europe would be restored on a capitalist basis. The Plan clearly ran counter to socialist programmes to restructure society, which had been formulated by many social-democratic parties after World War II.<sup>1</sup> Why then did the socialist parties of Western Europe support it?

One of the main reasons was that the West European Socialists were in no condition to embark on an anti-capitalist road of reconstruction and development, the one chosen by the countries of people's democracy. At the price of giving up their own programmes, they wanted to receive American assistance to cope with Western Europe's economic and social problems.

The postwar reconstruction period was marked by serious economic difficulties, an enormous unemployment rate, a low living standard, and a shortage of material and financial means. In this context it was impossible to carry out many of the reforms and improvements Social-Democrats had promised to the working people. The social-democratic parties faced the prospect of losing the support of the masses and of having their positions in parliaments and governments weakened. The social-democratic leaders viewed that as the downfall of all their efforts and hopes. The masses' disillusionment with the policies pursued by the social-democratic parties could stimulate revolutionary sentiments among the working people in Western Europe.

The social-democratic policy-makers certainly realised that the Marshall Plan might strengthen the positions of the European bourgeoisie and enhance the influence of US capital on the policies of West European countries. On the other hand, the

<sup>1</sup> In its 1945 election programme the British Labour Party proclaimed itself a socialist party aiming to establish socialism in Britain. The action programme adopted by the Austrian Socialist Party in 1947 stated: "In Austria there can be no return to the capitalist system of prewar days" (*Programm und Statut der Sozialistischen Partei Österreichs*, Vienna, 1955, p. 10). Similar declarations were made by other social-democratic parties of Europe as well.

plan was supposed to help overcome economic difficulties, increase industrial production and reduce unemployment, thereby creating prerequisites for initiating certain reforms and improving the living standard of the working people. The social-democratic leaders expected that solving these problems would enable their parties to heighten their influence among the masses and ensure their electoral success and seats in the government.

Moreover, influenced by bourgeois propaganda, many blue- and white-collar workers and small owners, who were also badly-off in those years, believed that the Marshall Plan could give them jobs, higher wages and better living conditions. That is why the Social-Democrats expected their proposals in support of the Marshall Plan to enhance their prestige among the masses.

Anti-communist designs also occupied an important place in the policy of West European right-wing Socialists. They calculated that their support of the Marshall Plan would weaken the authority of the Communists among the working people. The Social-Democrats themselves readily admit this. For instance, Julius Braunthal, commenting on the Marshall Plan, wrote that this action was undoubtedly designed to check the spread of communism in Europe.<sup>1</sup> Such were some of the reasons behind the support given to the Marshall Plan by West European social-democratic parties.

The anti-communist, anti-Soviet line in the policy of social-democratic parties became more prominent and in fact determined their activities.

The COMISCO leaders used the February 1948 developments in Czechoslovakia as a pretext for breaking off relations with East European social-democratic parties. The March 1948 COMISCO Conference denounced the Czechoslovak Social-Democratic Party for co-operating with the Communists and expelled it from COMISCO. Subsequently, the socialist parties of Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary were also expelled from COMISCO. The Conference denounced their activities and urged the Polish and Italian Social-Democrats not to follow the road chosen by them. The Polish Socialists, however, declared

<sup>1</sup> See: Julius Braunthal, *Geschichte der Internationale*, Vol. 3, Verlag I.L.W. Dietz Nachf. GmbH, Hannover, 1971, pp. 181-82.

that they would rather withdraw from COMISCO than obey its instructions.

In June 1948 at the Vienna COMISCO Conference the Italian Socialist Party was expelled from the Social-Democrats' organisation on the grounds that it had continued to act in unity with the Communists and participated in the general elections together with them.

Such action on the part of the COMISCO leadership proved once again that they in fact sought to split the unity of the working class and the working people as a whole. In addition to discontinuing their co-operation with the communist parties in their own countries they severed relations with social-democratic parties which continued to co-operate with the Communists, i.e., they fostered the split in the European social-democratic movement itself. West European social-democratic leaders thus dealt another blow at the working-class movement, undermined its strength and authority and objectively served the interests of the bourgeoisie and imperialists.

The course embarked upon by the leaders of West European social-democratic parties evoked justifiable displeasure on the part of many Social-Democrats. The prominent British Labourite Konni Zilliacus, addressing the 47th Labour Party Conference in 1948, said: "We embark on a policy which isolates and cuts us off from the greater part of the European working class. . . Why are we on bad terms with them to-day, when it is impossible to achieve Socialism in Europe, democracy in Europe, or peace in Europe without the co-operation of the workers in Europe. . . ? There is no alternative, short of joining Truman and Churchill in waging cold war."<sup>1</sup> However, the leaders of social-democratic parties did not heed the warning. Instead they severed ties with the revolutionary movement of the European working class and openly aligned themselves with Truman and Churchill.

The expulsion of East European social-democratic parties from COMISCO seriously weakened the positions of social-democracy and the entire workers' movement in Europe.

That socialist parties supported the Marshall Plan, advocated

<sup>1</sup> *Report of the Forty-Seventh Annual Conference of the Labour Party, Scarborough, 1948*, p. 116.

the policy of Western powers, denounced socialist measures undertaken in the countries of people's democracy and overtly opposed communist parties and the Soviet Union meant that in the struggle unfolding in the world arena the socialist parties of West Europe sided with the forces of reaction and war headed by the US imperialists. According to *The Tribune*, the organ of the left-wing Labourites, the actions taken by the socialist parties did not contain even the slightest hint of trying to pursue an independent policy, one differing from that of the bourgeoisie. Even the bourgeois *Manchester Guardian* pointed out that, unable to forge an independent policy, the West European Socialists turned themselves into a tool of the cold war. The leaders of the West European social-democracy tried to put the blame for splitting the European social-democratic movement and rupturing co-operation with the communist parties, which in fact they had inspired, on the Communists, the Cominform and the Soviet Union. Their claims run counter to historical fact and distort the true reasons for the widening split in the working-class movement in the cold war years. It would certainly be wrong to suggest that the Cominform and individual communist parties did not commit errors or take measures that did in fact impede, to a degree, co-operation between the Communists and the Social-Democrats and that hampered the workers' movement to achieve unity. Errors, unfortunately, were committed. In the context of intensified struggles in the world and in individual European countries, when right-wing Socialists pursued increasingly overt anti-Soviet and anti-communist policies, sectarian tendencies reappeared in the communist movement, which undoubtedly impeded co-operation between the communist and social-democratic parties.

The violation of human rights along with certain mistakes made by the influence of Joseph Stalin's personality cult not only in the Soviet Union but also in the countries of people's democracy should be also taken into account. Preparing and effecting the merger of workers' parties in the countries of people's democracy, the Communists committed certain errors, by being prone at times to bureaucracy, haste and sectarian intolerance vis-à-vis the workers who were members of social-democratic parties. All this evoked the displeasure of Social-Democrats, undermined their confidence in the communist parties and fos-



tered anti-Soviet and anti-communist sentiment in social-democratic parties.

Among the serious reasons behind the anti-Soviet and anti-communist tendencies within social-democratic ranks were the erroneous actions taken by Soviet state bodies and Joseph Stalin personally with respect to Yugoslavia. This contributed to a split in the workers' movement and the spread of anti-communist views in social-democratic parties. The errors committed by the Communists in those years are still being used by right Socialists to stir Social-Democrats to mistrust the present course of communist parties, a course towards united actions and co-operation with the Socialists.<sup>1</sup>

The above factors should be taken into account in order to avoid the mistakes made in the past and successfully solve the problems facing the working-class movement. Nonetheless, it was leaders of West European social-democratic parties who were primarily to blame for failing to use favourable conditions to achieve the unity of workers' parties. Their refusal to co-operate with the Communists and the latter's allies from among Social-Democrats, as well as their support of the anti-Soviet policy of US imperialism, were not spontaneous actions. These actions were brought about by the previous history of social-democracy, owing to its anti-communist and anti-Soviet positions, its alliance with bourgeois parties and adherence to social-reformist concepts.

The social-democratic leaders maintained that the goals of building socialism and restructuring West European countries along socialist lines could be reached through peaceful, non-violent methods, without bitter class struggles and revolution. Having adjusted themselves to the conditions of bourgeois democracy, during many decades resorting solely to parliamentary forms of struggle, they regarded reforms and class collaboration as sufficient and admissible methods in the struggle for socialism. When Czechoslovakia and other East European countries became a seat of acute class struggle involving thousands of armed workers, when the Communists and Socialists of Czechoslovakia

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, Karl Caernetz, *Die Sozialistische Internationale. Idee und Wirklichkeit*, Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, Vienna, 1972.

appealed to the people to take resolute mass action, West European Social-Democrats chose to interpret these actions as inadmissible acts of violence, terror and anarchy. The revolutionary people of Czechoslovakia prevented the bourgeois parties from forming by means of certain parliamentary manoeuvring their own government, and under the pressure of the working people, a government headed by Communists and left Socialists was formed. Right Socialists labelled the new regime "anti-democratic" and "totalitarian". They advocated reformist methods of struggle within the framework of the bourgeois parliamentary system and were incapable of understanding the historical necessity and inevitability of the establishment of the working class's power and fighting the bourgeoisie and capitalism. They proved to be unable to comprehend the true causes and character of the 1948 events in Czechoslovakia and therefore described them as a "communist conspiracy".

At a time when the class struggle both in individual European countries and in Europe as a whole was exacerbating, and an overt confrontation of the forces of revolution and counter-revolution was revealed, when it was necessary to decide whom to align with, the West European Social-Democrats, out of their fear of revolution, teamed up with the bourgeoisie in their countries and with the US imperialists.

The right Socialists, rather than embarking on the road of a resolute struggle against the bourgeoisie and capitalism, the road chosen by the working people in the countries of people's democracy under the guidance of Communists and left Socialists, chose to co-operate with the bourgeoisie in their countries and in the United States. They feared radical social and economic changes and the collapse of the economic and political systems in their countries, as well as the difficulties and sacrifices connected with bitter class struggle and fundamental restructuring of society on new principles. They felt the existence of their parties and organisations was threatened and feared losing their privileged positions in a bourgeois society.

All this determined the choice made by the Social-Democrats: they opted for an easier and more reliable, in their view, path towards their goals, one based on alliance with the bourgeoisie in their countries and with that of the United States.

Amidst increasingly aggravated international tension, which

was intensified, in addition to the above-mentioned factors, by the notorious "Berlin crisis" of 1948, many Social-Democrats were intimidated by the alleged danger of "Soviet aggression". Fearing the supposed "aggression", they argued that only a united front of all Western "democracies" could defend West European countries against "Soviet occupation". On the initiative of British Labourites and with the active participation of Socialists in other countries, the Brussels agreement on setting up the so-called West European alliance and the North Atlantic Treaty were signed (in March 1948 and April 1949, respectively). Social-Democrats either headed or had majority in seven out of the twelve governments which signed the Treaty.

Thus, it was not the Communists and the Soviet Union, as Socialists claim, but leaders of West European social-democracy that are responsible for a split in the European social-democratic movement and a halt in co-operation between the Communists and the Socialists. The expulsion of East European and Italian Socialists who had attempted to check anti-communist tendencies in the international socialist organisation paved the way for restoring a Socialist International of West European social-democratic parties unified by common ideology and policy. The presence of representatives of the left in the socialist movement was no longer an obstacle.

Issues relating to the above developments were discussed at a socialist conference in Baarn, Holland, in May 1949 and at COMISCO sessions held in July and December 1949. As before, the British and Scandinavian delegations objected to an early re-establishment of the International. Nonetheless, the December session invited a sub-committee chaired by Morgan Phillips to prepare a declaration on the basic principles of "democratic socialism", which would be acceptable to all member parties and serve as a first step towards reconstituting the International. The sub-committee submitted the declaration for discussion at the Copenhagen COMISCO Conference in June 1950. The Copenhagen Conference showed that no significant differences existed among the socialist parties in COMISCO on the major problems of world politics. However, the declaration on the principles of "democratic socialism" could not obtain a full consensus.

The French Socialists continued to proclaim their loyalty to Marxism. The Belgians, too, adhered to a number of Marxist

theses. The Austrian Socialists advocated the idea of Austro-marxism. The theoretical principles propagated by the German Social-Democrats in the early postwar years were extremely contradictory. The British Labourites overtly opposed Marxism. The Scandinavians, although they had more respect for theory than the British, subscribed to a theory somewhat similar to that of the Labourites. In this context a common document on the principles of "democratic socialism" could not be easily worked out. However, although the COMISCO members failed to reach agreement on all the problems discussed, they still managed to a certain extent to smooth out some of their differences and work out a common policy.

The aggravation of the international situation caused by the Korean war which broke out in June 1950 had a great impact on social-democratic leaders and intensified their desire to strengthen co-operation and common action in the international arena.

In early 1951 the last serious obstacle to reconstituting the Socialist International, i.e., the differences over the organisational principles of the Socialist International, was removed. In the early postwar years West European Social-Democrats had been unable to reach unanimity on this issue. The socialist parties of France, Austria and some other countries wanted to re-establish the Socialist International on the same organisational principles that prevailed in the prewar International, i.e., that members of the International were bound by its decisions. However, the British Labour Party, as well as social-democratic parties in Scandinavian and some other countries which were in power at the time, opposed the proposal. They sought complete freedom of action to pursue their policies and did not want to have their hands tied by resolutions adopted by an international social-democratic organisation. The Belgian Socialist Party, which had vigorously supported the idea of reconstituting the International, backed up the objection and suggested abandoning the proposal. Ultimately, this was fixed in a special COMISCO resolution.

Shortly after this a COMISCO session held in London in March 1951 adopted a decision to recommend the next International socialist conference to proclaim the Socialist International re-established.

What prompted the COMISCO leaders to take this step?

First of all, by restoring an organisation bearing the name

of "International", well-known and respected by all the working people, they sought to enhance their influence among the masses and to make their policies more authoritative and attractive. They believed that the official reconstitution of the Socialist International would lend more prestige to their international organisation, give more weight to their conferences and resolutions, and help them to unite the social-democratic movement on a reformist, anti-communist basis and to rally their forces to support the policies of the Western powers.

The desire of the leaders of West European social-democratic parties to use the united efforts of European Socialists to consolidate their influence in Asia, Africa and Latin America was another important consideration for recreating the International. The newly emerged states, democratic movements and socialist parties displayed strong anti-colonial, anti-imperialist sentiments and gravitated towards socialism. The leaders of West European social-democracy believed that by uniting in the International and acting in its name, they would be able to successfully propagate the ideas of "democratic socialism" in these countries and win over to their side representatives of national liberation movements and organisations. This was especially important since many of the latter overtly mistrusted the policies of certain West European social-democratic parties.

The social-democratic leaders also sought to strengthen ties among socialist parties, make the meetings of socialist leaders more regular, synchronise their activity, especially in the international arena, and to create a permanent mechanism for exchanging experience among them.

The fact that, by 1951, West European socialist parties had recovered from the wounds inflicted by nazism and the war, during which many of these parties ceased to exist altogether, and had restored their membership, party apparatus, press and international ties facilitated the reconstitution of the Socialist International. They had on the whole elaborated strategies and tactics adjusted to conditions of the cold war, the struggle between the two world systems. At the beginning of 1951 the social-democratic parties controlled the governments of Great Britain, Norway and Sweden and participated in the governments of Austria, Holland, France, Italy, Switzerland and some of the West German lands.

By the time the Socialist International was restored, the social-democratic parties had accumulated considerable experience in co-operation. Convinced that the International would serve their goals, the leaders of European social-democracy could reconstitute it without any apprehensions.

The first session of the 8th International Socialist Conference convened on June 30, 1951, in Frankfurt on the Main adopted a resolution which stated:

"a. That the International Socialist Conference should change its name to 'The Socialist International'

"b. that the Committee of the International Socialist Conference (COMISCO) should change its name to the 'Council of the Socialist International'

"c. that the Sub-committee of COMISCO should change its name to 'The Bureau of the Socialist International'."

The Conference discussed and adopted the International's programme and elected its governing bodies. Morgan Phillips was elected Chairman and Julius Braunthal Secretary of the International.

Thus, the Socialist International was finally restored. The re-establishment of the International testified to the fact that, despite the grave experience of the past, and the vital need for the Socialists and the Communists to pool their efforts, the right socialists returned to their previous course of splitting the unity of the working-class movement. It is not by chance, therefore, that the European and American bourgeoisie acclaimed the restoration of this international association of Socialists as a new tool in the struggle against the revolutionary workers' movement, as a new organisation designed to combat communism.

The parties which were united in the Socialist International in 1951 were different in terms of their power and authority, their positions and role within both their countries and the International. Besides the major, influential parties, mainly of West European countries, the Socialist International comprised smaller social-democratic organisations which had relatively small influence in their countries. Altogether the International numbered 34 members.

The West European Social-Democrats' efforts to attract organ-

<sup>1</sup> Saul Rose, *The Socialist International*, p. 8.

isations from non-European countries (mostly Asian and Latin American) into the International proved futile. The Socialist International has become an essentially West European association of Social-Democrats. This put an imprint on the Socialist International's entire activity. Between 1951 and 1980, almost all the chairmen and secretaries of the Socialist International were from West European social-democratic parties. The overwhelming majority of the International's congresses, Council conferences, numerous meetings of leaders of the major parties, and almost all the sessions of Socialist International Bureau were held in West European countries.

The dominance of West European parties over the Socialist International predetermined the character and the content of its activities. The International's ideology and policy were based on the social-reformist concepts propounded by West European social-democracy, while its activities were centred around issues affecting primarily the social-democratic parties of Western Europe.

## *Chapter Two*

### **THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL'S POLICY GOALS**

The Socialist International's policy goals testified to a considerable rightward shift in the social-democratic ideology, which was reflected in the refusal by the Socialist International leaders to support some of the important demands advanced by the working class and formulated in the documents of the prewar Labour and Socialist International.

Despite the continued ideological struggle within the social-democratic movement and a certain leftward shift in the 1970s, despite the need to adopt a new programme which is recognised by the Socialist International leadership, programmes elaborated in the early 1950s and the 1960s still tend to underlie its actions.

#### **1. The Programme of the Socialist International**

The Declaration on the Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism adopted by the First Congress of the Socialist International held in Frankfurt on the Main is the main programme document of the Socialist International. Although the world situation and the social-democratic movement have considerably changed since then, the Socialist International parties continue to regard the 1951 programme as the basis for their ideology and policy.

Due to the differences of opinion among democratic parties on a number of important issues in the early postwar years the elaboration of the Declaration was a time- and labour-consuming process.

That the parties' differences had not been fully overcome became clear at the Frankfurt Congress.

The British Labourites and the Dutch Socialists overtly opposed Marxism. Morgan Phillips emphasised at the Congress that the British workers' movement had never accepted the Marxist concept of class struggle.<sup>1</sup> In a memorandum submitted to the Congress, the Dutch Labour Party declared that in its view the Marxist trend in the international socialist movement was an "unavoidable evil".<sup>2</sup> The representatives of Austrian social-democracy stressed their adherence to "Austromarxism". Some of the delegations, in particular that of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and especially that of the French Socialist Party, supported Marxist ideas, but only in a social-democratic context.

Guy Mollet, for instance, said that in France "the entire party unconditionally recognised the Marxist analysis of capitalist society... None of the French Socialists is obliged to recognise dialectical materialism, but all French Socialists regard historic materialism as a fine method in studying the history of human society."<sup>3</sup>

However, declarations of this kind were not supported by the majority of delegates. As a result of the debate the supporters of traditional social-democratic views were forced to make considerable concessions. Of decisive importance was the stand taken by the leaders of the British Labour Party which at that time were highly influential in the Socialist International.

An analysis of the Socialist International's programme reveals the compromise character of this document. On the one hand, it retained a number of important demands voiced by the workers' movement and contained in the programme documents of the prewar Labour and Socialist International and its most influential parties; on the other, it encompassed new tenets which marked a considerable rightward shift in the ideological positions of the Social-Democrats. This is manifest in the refusal of the Socialist International to adhere to Marxism as the ideological and theoretical basis of the workers' movement. Instead, "ideo-

logical neutrality" was proclaimed, which implied that the Socialist International parties were not required to hold definite ideological and theoretical views and had a right to base their activity on any theoretical, philosophic or ideological positions they deemed most suitable for themselves. To quote from the Declaration, "socialism is an international movement which does not demand a rigid uniformity of approach. Whether Socialists build their faith on Marxist or other methods of analysing society, whether they are inspired by religious or humanitarian principles, they all strive for the same goal—a system of social justice, better living, freedom and world peace."<sup>4</sup>

Proclaimed "ideological neutrality" reflected the desire of the founders of the Socialist International to establish an ideological framework which would permit the uniting of as many parties as possible under the aegis of the Socialist International, including those which to a certain extent adhered to Marxism and those which had either never considered Marxism to be the basis of their ideology and policy or rejected it altogether. A more definite stand on these issues would have hampered co-operation among various parties within a single international social-democratic organisation. This was an especially graphic manifestation of the Socialist International's inherent tendency to reconcile various, sometimes apparently irreconcilable, positions, to smooth out in every way possible the parties' differences, and of its willingness to compromise in order to ensure a common approach of international social-democracy to the major problems of strategy and tactics.

As subsequent developments were to prove, the vagueness and "elasticity" of the Socialist International's ideological positions enabled the leaders of European social-democracy to attract not only social-democratic but also some other organisations, such as the popular parties in a number of Latin American countries, to the International.

The concept of "ideological neutrality" was also expedient for leaders of certain member parties of the Socialist International, since it enabled them to reconcile conflicting views and to retain within their parties both those who declared their loyalty to Marxism and those who overtly opposed it. The concept did not

<sup>1</sup> See: J. Braunthal, *op. cit.*, p. 245.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 216-47.

<sup>4</sup> *Yearbook*, 1956, p. 41.

formally deprive the supporters of Marxism of the right to hold and openly express their views. It made it possible for them to advocate a Marxist approach to the analysis of social phenomena and the formulation of the strategy and tactics of individual social-democratic parties.

Yet, the proclamation of "ideological neutrality", of course, played into the hands of right forces in the social-democratic parties and the Socialist International. On the pretext of abandoning "Marxist dogmas" and the "Marxist one-track approach" and under the guise of allegedly objective, unbiased analysis of issues facing them, they now had a good opportunity to impose non-Marxist, petty-bourgeois and at times overtly bourgeois views on the Socialist International.

The Socialist International's rightward shift is also evidenced by the fact that the Socialist International programme provides no scientific analysis of present-day capitalism and scientific criticism of its vices and contradictions, it fails to mention the concentration of economic and political power by monopolies, the development of state-monopoly capitalism, the growth of reactionary, anti-labour and militaristic tendencies in the capitalist states' policy. Nor does the International programme provide a concrete analysis of the situation in individual capitalist countries and various regions of the world.

Some critical judgements concerning capitalism that are contained in the programme relate in essence to the past. As far as the present-day situation in capitalist countries is concerned the authors of the Declaration tend to focus on "achievements" and "positive results" which have allegedly led to radical changes in capitalist society, rather than on the contradictions that plague capitalism. For instance, the Declaration maintains that "in many countries uncontrolled capitalism is giving place to an economy in which state intervention and collective ownership limit the scope of private capitalists".<sup>1</sup> It also points out that in these countries the need for planning and economic democracy is increasingly gaining recognition.

The programme stresses that in those countries where social-democratic parties have strong positions "the foundations of a Socialist society has already been laid. Here the evils of capitalism

<sup>1</sup> *Yearbook*, 1956, p. 40.

are disappearing and the community has developed new vigour."<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the programme distorts the picture of capitalism in Western countries in the 1950s. Whether the authors of the Declaration intended this to be so or not, their description of capitalist society in fact beautified capitalism and drew a veil over its reactionary, anti-humane, exploitative nature.

The crisis that plagued capitalist economies in the 1970s, the sharp rise in unemployment, soaring inflation, the aggravation of the energy, monetary and raw material crises, capitalism's inability to cope with environmental problems and solve the problems of education and health care—such is the reality of bourgeois society that revealed the groundlessness of the Socialist International leaders' conclusions on the results of and the prospects for the development of capitalism, and of their attempts to prove that "the foundations of a Socialist society has already been laid" in Western countries.

An analysis of the Frankfurt Declaration reveals considerable changes in the Socialist International's stand on the historical prospects for eliminating capitalism and establishing socialism. Previously the Social-Democrats had proceeded from the Marxist analysis and regarded the replacement of capitalism with socialism as an inevitable result of the evolution of capitalism, the exacerbation of its contradictions and class struggles, as a result of the natural historical movement of society from the old, capitalist socio-economic formation to a new, socialist one. The Frankfurt Declaration, however, formulated this thesis differently: socialism was interpreted as the embodiment of ethical principles, the ideas of pure reason and absolute freedom, the eternal ideals of justice and the common weal. As the International programme puts it, "Socialists oppose capitalism not only because it is economically wasteful and because it keeps the masses from their material rights, but above all because it revolts their sense of justice."<sup>2</sup> The Socialist International's position on the problem was disclosed even more clearly in the Statement on Socialism and Religion adopted in 1953 at a Special Conference of the Socialist International: "Socialism is a moral pro-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> *Yearbook*, 1956, p. 44.

test against the debasement of man in modern society. . . Socialist policy, therefore, is the practical working-out of an ethic which may be derived either from religious or from non-religious sources." The Statement stresses that the ethical principles underlie socialist ideals and policies.<sup>1</sup>

These and other similar statements by the Socialist International and its parties absolutise ethical principles, while socialism is pictured by the ideologists of social-democracy as the expression of eternal moral categories.

Having rejected the Marxist concept of society's transition from capitalism to socialism, the International leaders failed to formulate a scientific programme of struggle for socialism. The developments since the adoption of the Socialist International policy-making declaration and especially the events of the 1970s demonstrated the erroneousness and one-sidedness of the Social-Democrats' position on these issues.

It is also remarkable that the leaders of socialist parties silently bypassed the question of the working-class movement in capitalist countries and the struggle of the working people for their vital interests. The Declaration failed to mention the strikes and other forms of the working people's struggle for their demands.

The Socialist International's rightward shift is especially manifest in the strong anti-communist orientation of its programme. The International leaders sought to separate themselves from the communist parties and to avoid including in their programme any provisions which might to a certain extent coincide with the policy aims and tasks of the Communists. Whereas prior to the war and in the early postwar years social-democratic leaders had often argued that their dispute with the Communists was more so on the methods and means of attaining socialism than on socialism as their ultimate goal, they now opposed Communists practically on all principal issues.

The authors of the International programme slandered the Communists in every possible way, depicting them as the enemies of peace and democracy.

The Socialist International claimed that the Communists' struggle for establishing workers' power, described by the founders of scientific socialism as the dictatorship of the proletariat,

<sup>1</sup> *Yearbook*, 1956, p. 45.

allegedly implied the elimination of democracy. According to the International programme "every dictatorship, wherever it may be, is a danger to the freedom of all nations and thereby to the peace of the world".<sup>1</sup> The leaders of the Socialist International patently distorted the true state of affairs: they equated the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., workers' power, which is a new, higher type of democracy in comparison with bourgeois democracy, with fascist dictatorship, i.e., domination by the most reactionary terrorist forces of monopoly capital, a domination which deprives the workers and all working people of their basic rights and freedoms.

During the cold war the leaders of West European social-democracy forgot the lessons of the prewar and war years and the common struggle with the Communists against fascism and again espoused anti-communist positions.

The programme of the Socialist International also provided a distorted picture of the situation in socialist countries and, in this way, fostered the proliferation of anti-communist prejudices among the masses and diverted their attention from the actual problems being generated by capitalism. West European social-democratic leaders thereby hampered the growth of class awareness and activity of the working people in their struggle against the domination of Big Capital and the entire system of state-monopoly capitalism.

The Socialist International's rightward shift can be also observed in social-democratic theorists' interpretation of socialism and especially of the ways and means of building a socialist society. To counterbalance the theory of scientific communism the Socialist International advanced the concept of "democratic socialism" which it counterposed to both scientific and existing socialism. The social-democratic leaders tried to prove that their concept of socialism alone met the requirements of social development and the working people's interests and could guarantee the transformation of capitalism into a socialism of their own design.

The term "democratic socialism", as well as many of the ideas that underlay it, were introduced by right Socialists as early as the beginning of the 20th century. At that time, however, "de-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 42.



democratic socialism" was not yet a fully elaborated doctrine or a generally recognised principle of the ideology and policy of international social-democracy. This concept has now become an official doctrine of the Socialist International and its member parties, and constitutes the ideological credo of present-day social-democracy underlying the programmes of the socialist parties. The concept is expounded in the Declaration of the Socialist International policy on the Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism.

What is implied by "democratic socialism" and what are its main principles? According to the ideologists of the Socialist International, the concept is instrumental in two ways: it determines, first, the goal of the social-democratic movement and, second, the ways and means of attaining this goal.

According to the Frankfort Declaration, the goal of the Socialist International and its parties consists in transforming capitalist society and replacing it with "democratic socialism". The Socialist International's programme states that capitalism is an unjust social system which breeds inequality and exploitation of the majority by the minority, causes the poverty and privation of the working people, ensures the use of society's wealth in the interests of small privileged groups, fosters enslavement of nation by nation, promotes war, violence, anti-democratic dictatorial regimes, etc. Such a society, say the Social-Democrats, must be replaced by a truly just, humane, democratic society, one based on socialism. The programme declares that "socialism aims to liberate the peoples from dependence on a minority which owns or controls the means of production. It aims to put economic power in the hands of the people as a whole, and to create a community in which free men work together as equals."<sup>1</sup>

According to the International's programme, "democratic socialism" implies a society which will establish political, economic and social democracy.

The authors of the programme maintain that the prime prerequisite and the necessary basis of a socialist society is the consolidation of political democracy which guarantees every individual democratic rights and political freedoms, including freedom of speech, education, assembly and religion; representation

<sup>1</sup> *Yearbook*, 1956, p. 40.

of the people by free elections on the basis of universal and equal suffrage by secret ballot; the rule of the majority and respect for the rights of the minority; equality before the law of all citizens, irrespective of race, sex, language, denomination or skin colour; the right to opposition. The attainment of political democracy, the programme stresses, is a prerequisite for economic and social democracy. As is seen from this description of "political democracy", it has many of the traits which are in fact inherent in democracy in socialist society: the ensurance of political rights and freedoms of the working people, the equality of all citizens before the law, etc.

However, the description of democracy obtaining in a socialist society which is contained in the Frankfort Declaration is extremely contradictory. On the one hand, it reflects the aspiration of the working people to genuine freedom and equality; on the other, it lacks clearcut class criteria in assessing political democracy. This confuses the working masses and hampers their struggle against bourgeois rule, for working class power and socialist democracy.

The programme stresses one more important element of democratic socialism—the consolidation of economic democracy, that is, of such an economic system which ensures the society's control over the entire economy and the use of the society's wealth in the interests of the whole of the people, rather than of those of a privileged minority.

According to the Frankfort Declaration, "Socialism seeks to replace capitalism by a system in which the public interest takes precedence over the interest of private profit."<sup>1</sup>

The social-reformist theorists hold that public ownership is to play an important role in strengthening "economic democracy". Its size, forms and functions in various industries may differ from country to country. Everything depends on the specific features of the economic structure, national traditions, economic situation, etc.

The Programme reads that public ownership can be brought about by nationalising existing private concerns or creating new public concerns, municipal and regional enterprises, and consumer and producer co-operatives. These various forms of public

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 42.



ownership, the programme points out, should be regarded "as means of controlling basic industries and services on which the economic life and welfare of the community depend, of rationalising inefficient industries or of preventing private monopolies and cartels from exploiting the public".<sup>1</sup>

Taken as a whole, these provisions of the International programme undoubtedly echo the interests of the working class and the working people as a whole and correspond to their desire to do away with the domination of private ownership, and to liberate themselves from exploitation. At the same time, the programme contains certain theses which largely depreciate these provisions. Significantly, the programme fails to state unequivocally that public ownership should be the economic basis of socialist society.

This is one of the main drawbacks of the "democratic socialism" concept: it clearly underestimates the decisive importance of eliminating capitalist and establishing public ownership of the basic means of production in order to ensure the society's transition from capitalism to socialism.

Political and economic freedoms, important and valuable as they are, provide, according to the Socialist International's ideologists, nothing more than a foundation for achieving social-democracy in a society. Without asserting social-democracy it is impossible to attain the ideals of socialism as it is represented by the social-democratic ideologists. According to the Declaration, socialism safeguards not only basic political but also economic and social rights. To quote from the programme, "while the guiding principle of capitalism is private profit, the guiding principle of socialism is the satisfaction of human needs."<sup>2</sup>

The Socialists argue that they seek to eradicate economic, political and judicial discrimination according to sex, social background, religion, etc. The leaders of the International state that their task is to liberate people from all forms of oppression and insecurity.

Such are the basic points of the Socialist International programme concerning socialism as the goal of the social-democratic movement. For all the declaratory character of the programme.

<sup>1</sup> *Yearbook*, 1956, p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 43.

the inconsistency and groundlessness of a number of its important theses (this will be discussed in more detail below) one cannot but notice that many of its principles are in harmony with the socialist ideal. This concerns, for instance, the theses on the necessity to create a society free from class, national and racial oppression, from the exploitation of man by man and working people's poverty and privation, a society enjoying complete freedom and equality, guaranteed by the working people's social rights.

These theses show that, despite the rightward evolution of social-democracy, the programme of the Socialist International has retained many demands traditionally advanced by the working-class movement, demands which reflect the age-old aspirations of the working people, their longing for a just, socialist society.

It is of interest to analyse the ways of attaining the socialist goals as proposed by the Socialist International programme.

The programme proceeds from the belief that these goals can be achieved without bitter class struggles, without a socialist revolution, without consolidating the power of the working class. The programme maintains that socialism can be attained only by peaceful, non-violent means, through reforms and changes, in conditions of peace among classes and co-operation with the bourgeoisie, its parties and organisations. Acute class struggles, revolution, and violence, the programme declares, can only bring disaster and suffering, without guaranteeing the attainment of socialist goals. In declaring this, the Socialist International retreats from positions which the Labour and Socialist International held in the period between the wars, when class struggle was regarded as the main means of reaching the goals of the workers' movement.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The resolution adopted by the First Congress of the Labour and Socialist International (1923) proclaimed: "The Labour and Socialist International is a union of such parties as accept the principle of the economic emancipation of the workers from capitalist domination and the establishment of the Socialist Commonwealth as their object, and the class struggle which finds its expression in the independent political and industrial action of the workers' organisations as a means of realising that object." (*Socialist International Information* (hereafter referred to as *SI*)), No. 18-19, 1961, p. 207).

As history has irrefutably proved, the "democratic road to socialism" suggested by Social-Democrats is unfeasible. The ruling classes of bourgeois society have never given up their dominant positions and privileges voluntarily, without class struggle and revolutionary violence. Only the struggle of the masses and resolute revolutionary measures can terminate bourgeois domination, consolidate working-class power and pave the way towards socialism. However, these methods are rejected by the Socialist International.

The International programme does not recognise the necessity of class struggle in eliminating capitalism and building socialism, and what is more, it ignores the special, leading role of the working class in the efforts to establish a new system. Here, too, the Socialist International has retreated from positions held by the international social-democracy in the past. Suffice it to call to mind that the Labour and Socialist International proceeded in its strategy and tactics from the well-known Marxist thesis on the historical mission of the working class as the grave-digger of capitalism and the builder of socialism. However, the Socialist International programme does not say a single word about this.

Similarly, the Socialists fail to mention the decisive role of the popular masses in history. They believe that socialism will be effected primarily through the parliamentary and governmental activity of the leaders of social-democratic parties.

Though the Preamble of the Frankfurt Declaration points out that socialism "cannot succeed without thorough-going and active participation by the peoples" and that it "demands a personal contribution from all its followers"<sup>1</sup>, the way the programme's authors elaborate on this statement, as well as the many years of their practical activity, testify to the contrary. The role of the masses is confined by them primarily to their participation in election campaigns and ensuring dominant positions for socialist and social-democratic leaders in parliaments and governments. The decisive role in implementing social and economic reforms aimed, as the social-democratic ideologists see it, at transforming capitalism into socialism should be left to the social-democratic leaders. They form the elite which heads governments and various government bodies, and give priority to parliamentary

<sup>1</sup> Yearbook, 1956, p. 41.

methods of struggle in their activity. They treat parliamentary activity not as a form of class struggle supported by the extra-parliamentary struggle waged by the workers and all the working people, but rather as a means to reach agreement and compromise with the leaders of other parties.

Thus, according to their programme, the social-democratic ideologists assign the leading role in restructuring the society along socialist lines to the leaders of social-democratic parties and the governments they head rather than to the working class and the popular masses. This reflects their inherent fear of the working people, of their revolutionary activity and creative ability. They are afraid that such activity may get beyond their control and lead to radical changes exceeding the limits of reformist programmes.

Fearful of the revolutionary activity of the working people and unwilling to involve them in the management of society and in the struggle against bourgeois rule, the International's parties find themselves at an impasse. Their fear of the masses and class struggle renders them powerless and incapable of effecting a radical restructuring of society on a new, socialist basis. This testifies to the bankruptcy of the social-democratic concept of "democratic socialism" and of the entire programme of the Socialist International.

No wonder that these aspects of the International programme were hailed by the bourgeois press. For instance, in July 1951, *The Economist* wrote with satisfaction that in Frankfurt on the Main those who held Marxist views were forced to retreat and to reject the idea of proletarian revolution and class struggle. *The Manchester Guardian* wrote at the same time that the Declaration of the Socialist International did not call for the proletarians to rise up in arms and that it rejected all the militant slogans of the earlier manifestoes of social-democratic parties. *The Times* also noted that the class struggle was rejected by the International.

The problem of democracy is the focal point of the social-democratic concept of the transformation of capitalism into socialism. The social-democratic parties regard the establishment and maintenance of democracy as their primary task.

However, in treating these problems the social-democratic ideologists advanced erroneous arguments holding that the task

of establishing political democracy is relevant only for countries with fascist, militarist and other dictatorial and non-democratic regimes. As for the West European countries and other industrialised countries, the social-democratic movement does not have to set itself this task since these countries allegedly enjoy extensive democracy essential for building socialism. The leaders of the Socialist International believe that the Western democratic parliamentary system fully meets the requirements of the political democracy which should exist under socialism. They regard democracy and the state in these countries as supra-class, non-class institutions serving in a similar way the interests of all strata of the society and constituting a ready-made political system within which the historical transition from capitalism to socialism will be effected. Moreover, in their opinion, the state machinery in developed capitalist countries will serve as a major instrument for transforming society and building socialism.

As to the non-class and supra-class nature of the state, the social-democratic ideologists proceed, in particular, from the fact that social-democratic parties increasingly dominate the Western governments. The participation of Social-Democrats in government allegedly testifies to the neutral character of the state and the entire state machinery which is often compared with an automobile, since it can move in any direction and reach any point, depending on the will of the driver. Therefore, the social-democratic theorists argue, there is no need to change, restructure or break this machinery. On the contrary, it should be preserved, guided in the desired direction and used to build a new society.

This position of the Socialist International leaders is clearly based on the oversimplification of an extremely complex problem. The years that have elapsed since the time the International programme was adopted have shown that the above arguments are a far cry from reality and do not take into consideration the actual character and role of the state and the state machinery even in the most democratic countries of the capitalist world. The practical activity of the state apparatus and state agencies in capitalist countries which have democratic parliamentary regimes (to say nothing of the countries with military, authoritarian or fascist regimes) shows that in their nature and the main results of their operation these states are of a class character, expressing and defending primarily the interests of the bourgeoisie and mo-

nopolies. Their state institutions are created to effectively safeguard the political, economic and ideological interests of wealthy ruling classes and the entire system of state-monopoly capitalism.

The record of history has convincingly proved that it is impossible to abolish capitalism and build socialism without replacing the bourgeois state with a socialist state and bourgeois democracy with socialist democracy. By refusing to recognise these tasks of the labour movement, the Socialist International and its parties doom to failure all their plans of transforming capitalism into socialism.

The ways of transforming capitalist economy into socialist economy suggested by the Frankfurt Declaration are equally groundless.

It is a known fact that in the past the socialists agreed that it was impossible to do away with capitalism and establish socialism without eliminating the domination of private ownership, without socialisation of the main instruments and means of production. The 1925 Heidelberg Programme of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany stated, for instance, that "the aim of the working class can be reached only by transforming capitalist private ownership of the instruments and means of production into public ownership. The working class cannot effect the socialisation of the means of production without seizing political power".<sup>1</sup>

The International programme formulates this problem differently. On the one hand, it points out that to attain the goals of socialism it is necessary to place the economy at the entire society's service and socialise certain sectors of the economy, stresses that socialist planning is "incompatible with the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few".<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, the programme states that socialisation of private property is not a matter of principle but of economic expediency, and that "socialist planning" and "democratic control" are more essential for reaching socialist goals than socialisation of capitalist private property. As the Frankfurt Declaration puts it, "socialist planning does not presuppose public ownership of all the means of pro-

<sup>1</sup> *Programme der Deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, Verlag J.H.W. Dietz Nachf. GmbH., Hannover, 1963, p. 93.

<sup>2</sup> *Yearbook*, 1956, p. 42.

duction. It is compatible with the existence of private ownership in important fields" of the economy.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the programme of the Socialist International has rejected one of the basic principles of socialism—the transformation of capitalist private ownership into public ownership—and has assigned the main role in transforming the economy along socialist lines and attaining other socialist goals to "democratic planning" and "democratic control".

This radical change in the Socialist International's stand was noted by the bourgeois press with great satisfaction. For example, in June 1951 *The Times* wrote that the International Declaration replaced its former slogan of instituting public ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange by that of production planning. The *Financial Times* of London noted that the socialisation of industry ceased to be a dogma of the socialist creed. *The Economist* explained that nationalisation was no longer seen as a universal panacea but rather as a principle varying in its applicability and value from country to country.

The rejection of the idea of socialising capitalist property by the Socialist International implies that the socialist goals formulated in the International programme were in fact considered unattainable. Indeed, if a society retains capitalist private ownership, even in the less important branches of industry, this means that capitalist relations, the division of society into antagonistic classes, class inequality, the exploitation of man by man and other evils and injustice stemming from it will be retained, too.

The programme's arguments on "democratic planning" in the interests of the entire society and "democratic control" over the economy are also largely groundless, primarily because social-democratic leaders assign the main role in solving these tasks to the state machinery existing in capitalist countries. The programme declares: "The state must prevent private owners from abusing their powers. It can and should assist them to contribute towards increased production and well-being within the framework of a planned economy."<sup>2</sup> However, the programme of the International does not formulate the task of radically changing the state and state machinery in capitalist countries. The social-democratic ideologists believe in essence that a planned development

<sup>1</sup> *Yearbook*, 1956, pp. 42-43.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 43.

of the economy in the interests of entire society and "democratic control" can be effectively ensured by the existing bourgeois state and state machinery. Nonetheless, the results of social-democratic government in many Western countries have proved such reckoning to be groundless.

Whether the Socialist International leaders wish this to be so or not, their programme of laying economic foundations for socialism is theoretically unsubstantiated and politically harmful since it breeds illusion among the working people about the possibility of building socialism without abolishing capitalist private ownership and without radically transforming the bourgeois state.

Analysing the content and essential principles of the Socialist International programme one cannot but notice its contradictory and eclectic character. On the one hand, it declares necessary the establishment of a socialist society, on the other, it offers a description of socialism and the means of building it which are clearly impracticable and groundless.

The contradictory nature of the programme, the fact that it contains both socialist ideas fostering the working people's class struggle and reformist ideas justifying the theory and practice of class collaboration, enables the supporters of various trends in social-democracy to interpret it differently using its statements and propositions in favour of both Marxist, left-wing socialist and anti-Marxist, right-wing socialist concepts.

In defending and propagating their stand, the representatives of left forces in the social-democratic movement refer to those points in the Frankfurt Declaration which proclaim the necessity to replace capitalism with socialism, ensuring true democracy for the working people, establishing public ownership in major branches of the economy, radically transforming the bourgeois political and economic system, guaranteeing genuine equality, freedom and the satisfaction of all working people's needs, ensuring their political and social rights, creating conditions for raising their living standard, developing culture, uprooting all forms of exploitation and oppression, etc.

The right Socialists, on the contrary, while substantiating their stand, proceed from those theses in the International programme which reflect the Social-Democrats' considerable rightward shift: on the rejection of Marxism, the class struggle, and the need for eliminating capitalist private ownership and estab-

lishing public ownership. Priority is given to collaboration among classes, parliamentary forms of struggle, "pure democracy", the "supra-class" character of the bourgeois state, reformist methods in attaining the labour movement's goals, etc.

The social-democratic ideologists sought to picture the Frankfort Declaration as an epoch-making document, as important as such documents as *Manifesto of the Communist Party* of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. They sought to portray it as the only correct programme, meeting the vital requirements of social development in our time and the main tasks of the contemporary labour movement, as a programme offering mankind a "third way" of social development, allegedly different both from capitalism and communism, and incorporating all the achievements that can be gained by humanity today.

In reality, however, the International programme is a far cry from the kind of document the social-democratic ideologists advertised. It neither contains a scientifically-based description of the modern age and the main tendencies in its development, nor provides an analysis of the chief forces confronting one another in capitalist countries, ones able to ensure the progress of society from capitalism to socialism, on the one hand, and ones hampering this historical progress, on the other. Unable to provide a concrete analysis of class forces and the class struggle unfolding in capitalist countries these days, the programme is nothing more than a collection of abstract concepts.

The record itself has shown that the "democratic socialism" doctrine formulated in the programme is unable to show the working people the road to victory over capitalism. On the contrary, by directing the struggle of the workers along the road of reformism and anti-communism, it impedes the growth of their class consciousness and political activity and hampers their efforts to attain socialist goals. Moreover, there is a gap between the policy declarations of the Socialist International and the results of the practical activity of its leaders and parties both in the past and at present: through participation in government social-democratic parties have never reached the main goals formulated in the Frankfort Declaration, and this is not merely a consequence of its rejection of the socialist ideal itself but largely a consequence of the fact that their programme of abolishing capitalism and building socialism is impracticable and unrealistic.

## 2. Discussion on the Problems of "Democratic Socialism"

The adoption of the Programme of the Socialist International generated a lively debate in social-democratic parties.

Many Socialists did not approve of scuttling some of the past traditions and views of social-democracy. Doubts and objections were voiced not only by rank-and-file party members but also by a number of prominent figures in the Socialist International, such as the leader of the French Socialists, Guy Mollet.

Many Socialists who thought highly of Marxist ideas and supported the traditional demands of the labour movement voiced concern over the rightward shift in the International's Programme, questioning and opposing a number of the provisions contained in the Frankfort Declaration. Benedikt Kautsky, one of the foremost ideologists of European social-democracy, for instance, acknowledged that the old radical concepts, including the class struggle, proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, were still popular with some Social-Democrats, for example, the Austrian Socialists.<sup>1</sup>

This could not but alarm the social-democratic leaders. They deemed it necessary to provide a more detailed interpretation of the policy-making principles of the Socialist International and to substantiate the changes in its stand more convincingly. A great number of articles, brochures and books appeared that set forth their views of world development and the tasks of "democratic socialism".

The late 1950s were marked by an especially heated ideological debate among Socialists. Besides the reasons mentioned above, it was stirred by the desire of the social-democratic leadership to substantiate the need for changing earlier programmes of social-democratic parties. As a rule, these programmes, adopted in the 1920s or even prior to World War I, charted the goals of social-democratic parties primarily on the basis of Marxist ideas. Regarded as excessively radical, they no longer suited the socialist leadership in the 1950s. Moreover, on a number of important issues they contradicted the Programme of the Socialist International.

The ideological debate was also caused by the fact that in the

<sup>1</sup> See: *SI*, No. 16, 1956, p. 283.

1950s certain social-democratic parties in Western Europe faced serious difficulties during election campaigns, losing votes and suffering defeat in parliamentary elections. This provoked bitter controversy on the reasons for these setbacks and growing difficulties and on ways of overcoming them. The right-wing leaders felt that the difficulties and setbacks suffered during elections were due to the radical demands contained in previous social-democratic programmes that frightened off the middle strata of the population—white-collar workers, engineers and technicians, professional people and small businessmen. They felt that these difficulties could be surmounted by giving up a number of the demands advanced by the labour movement, by overcoming the “narrow”, class character of the social-democratic parties and turning them from the working class parties into broad-based “people’s” parties.

The growth of right-wing tendencies in social-democratic parties evoked displeasure and opposition on the part of left-wing Socialists. In a number of countries, the struggle between the right and the left resulted in the splitting of socialist parties and the emergence of independent left-wing socialist organisations, such as the United Socialist Party of France (1958), the Dutch Pacifist Socialist Party (1958), the Socialist People’s Party of Norway (1961), the Social-Democratic League of Workers and Small Farmers of Finland (1959). The strife within social-democracy was accompanied by ideological activity of both right-wing and left-wing Socialists.

The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers’ Parties of the Socialist Countries held in Moscow in 1957 had a significant impact on the ideological activity of the Social-Democrats. At first, the right-wing forces succeeded in enhancing anti-communist propaganda and fostering anti-communist prejudices in social-democratic parties by referring to the criticism of Stalin’s personality cult and its consequences. However, the anti-communist fog gradually cleared and by the late 1950s and early 1960s, many Social-Democrats had become more sober-minded in assessing new ideas and approaches to the class struggle which were formulated by the Communists. In this context, the Socialist International’s leadership sought to use broad ideological debates in order to minimise the impact of commun-

ist ideas upon the social-democratic parties and the broad masses of the working people and to defend their own views and concepts.

The debate in social-democratic parties and the Socialist International covered a wide range of problems. Among the most acute problems discussed was social-democracy’s attitude to Marxism, as Marxism had served as the theoretical basis for the ideology and policy of many social-democratic parties and many working people continued to believe in Marxism and were inspired by its ideas in the struggle for their interests.

Taking all this into account, some of the social-democratic leaders opposed unconditional rejection of Marxism. They felt that it was both dangerous and unprofitable for them to renounce Marx, whom the world’s working people had always regarded as the founder of scientific socialism and the First International and the most consistent fighter against capitalism. Some of the Socialist International’s leaders recognised Marx’s historic services to the labour movement and the importance of making use of his scientific legacy. Typical in this respect were the pronouncements of the Secretary of the Socialist International, Julius Braunthal. In his article “Marxism and Socialism Today”, he wrote: “The question under debate is whether Socialism [i.e., the social-democratic movement—*N.S.*] needs Marxism as an ideological basis or whether Socialism today can fulfil its tasks without Marxism.” Answering this question, Braunthal stated: “It cannot, of course, be seriously disputed that the Socialist Movement can advance without the heritage of Marxism—at least at its present stage of development, when it has, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously, absorbed a mass of Marxist thinking which has become part and parcel of its ideology and continues to affect Socialist thinking.”<sup>1</sup>

References to Marx were also included in the programmes of some social-democratic parties. For instance, a passage in the introduction to the Programme of Principles adopted by the Finnish Social-Democratic Party in 1952 read: “Although the Social-Democratic Party of Finland is not a Marxist party, it is based on Marx’s theory of the international socialist workers’ movement

<sup>1</sup> *SII*, No. 19, 1954, pp. 337, 339.



and is, in fact, a socialist workers' party whose principles are consonant with the spirit of modern social-democracy."<sup>1</sup>

However, such references to Marx and recognition of the role of Marxism were very rare among leaders of the Socialist International. The majority of them insisted that "Marxist dogmas" be rejected. Erich Ollenhauer, Chairman of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, speaking at his Party's Congress in Bad Godesberg in November 1959, said: "In the discussions on the new programme, the adherents of Marxism in our ranks have been fighting passionately for the preservation of Marxist ideas. Yet the demand that we should take our bearings for our fundamental programme of 1959 from the political programme of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels is as un-Marxist as possible. If we were to follow these ideas we would within a short time be a sect without political influence."<sup>2</sup>

Erich Ollenhauer and other proponents of this view obviously proceeded from the pragmatic task of trying to win over to their side working people (primarily, the middle urban strata) who were not prepared to support Marxist theses. By opposing Marxism the ideologists of social-democracy sought to prove that Marxism had become antiquated and therefore could not serve as a foundation for social-democratic theory and practice. Among the advocates of this view was Paul Ramadier, a prominent figure in the French Socialist Party. What made Marxism "antiquated", in his opinion? "The idea that social change is inevitably brought about by catastrophe and revolution, which derives from growing tension in social relations, no longer holds," he argued. "Social progress is pursued by gradual easy climbs. . . . Another new factor is the transformation of capitalism. It no longer rests on the private ownership of the entrepreneur, nor on free competition. . . . This capitalism of the enterprise no longer has any relationship but that of origin with private capitalism, the only one known to and studied by Marx."<sup>3</sup>

Obviously, both arguments put forward by Ramadier to substantiate his assertion that Marxism is outdated are clearly groundless.

<sup>1</sup> SPD. *Sozialdemokratische Partei*, Paasipano, Helsinki, 1963.

<sup>2</sup> *SH*, No. 48, 1959, p. 738.

<sup>3</sup> *SH*, No. 21-22, 1958, pp. 325, 326.

No doubt, certain improvements in capitalist countries can be effected without radical transformations. Nonetheless, these improvements cannot substantially alter the position of the working masses, abolish the economic and political domination of the bourgeoisie, ensure genuine emancipation of the working class and all the working people from capitalist exploitation and result in society's transition from capitalism to socialism. These historic tasks cannot be fulfilled by "gradual easy climbs". They call for radical changes in the political and economic system, for revolution. The record has corroborated the Marxist idea of social revolutions as history's locomotives.

The allegations by Ramadier and other social-democratic ideologists that modern capitalism is radically different from the one "known to and studied by Marx" are equally groundless. It goes without saying that since Marx's times capitalism has undergone significant changes. The capitalism of free competition has developed into monopoly capitalism with state-monopoly tendencies playing a determinative role in its development. However, neither the rise and supremacy of monopolies, nor the greater role of the bourgeois state in societal life have eliminated the political and economic domination of big capital. These factors have not served to eliminate the dominant position of private ownership and the system of exploitation of man by man, the division of society into antagonistic classes, social, national and racial inequality and oppression, economic crises, unemployment and other evils generated by capitalism. Many of them were analysed by Marx.

The question of the Socialists' attitude to democracy and the state as they exist in developed capitalist countries was among the most widely discussed by the Social-Democrats. The fact that the Socialist International and its parties rejected the class-based approach to bourgeois democracy and the state, the active co-operation of social-democratic parties with bourgeois parties and bourgeois governments, and their support of the so-called "democratic legal state" were questioned and criticised by many Socialists. This is understandable: since its inception socialism has always implied elimination of the political domination of the bourgeoisie, the establishment of working-class power and replacement of the bourgeois state by a proletarian state. Generations of Social-Democrats were brought up to support these principles.

Their leaders, having rejected this essential demand of the labour movement, had to explain the "necessity" of such an about-face. This determined the subject-matter of discussions at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist International in 1959. Oscar Pollak, an Austrian Socialist and one of the ideologists of European social-democracy, defended the stand of the right-wing Socialists in his speech at the Congress, declaring that the attitude of the working class and the social-democratic parties to the state existing in Western countries could no longer be the same as it was in the past. Whereas formerly the attitude of the workers to the state in capitalist countries was negative since they constituted an oppressed class and had no real political rights and opportunities to exert their influence upon state affairs, now, Pollak argued, the situation had radically changed because the workers had allegedly "become participants in government". He emphasised that the state no longer belonged solely to the bourgeoisie, but to the workers too, who "in many cases share the government of the state with other classes".<sup>1</sup> Pollak concluded that owing to the changed position of the workers in society and the changed character of the state the attitude of the workers and all the working people to the state should change as well. Instead of opposing the existing state they should defend it and make use of it to reach their goals.

The thesis about the changed character of the bourgeois state and the resultant changes in the working people's attitude towards it constitutes one of the most important points of departure in substantiating all kinds of "latest theories" elaborated by the Social-Democrats.

However, not all the Socialists and their leaders supported this view. Thus the above-mentioned theses were questioned and opposed at the Sixth Congress of the International held in 1959. This was reflected, specifically in a speech by Belgian Socialist Victor Larock, a prominent figure in the Socialist International, who noted that the situation existing in the capitalist countries was a far cry from the ideal depicted by Pollak.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *SH*, No. 1-2, 1960, pp. 3-4.

<sup>2</sup> According to Larock, "behind political democracy, behind governments and parliaments, there is a power that has no place in the constitutions but often holds the real authority. This power, capitalist power... has means which we Socialists lack, which the working class cannot aspire to" (*SH*, No. 1-2, 1960, p. 27).

Recent years have convincingly disproved of those Social-Democrats who picture the modern state in Western countries as some neutral body transcending the class structure. The large-scale offensive launched in the West against the social gains of the working people in the late 1970s and early 1980s shows that in Western countries the state defends, first and foremost, the interests of big capital and monopolies, and not those of the working people.

Attitudes of the socialist parties to private ownership and nationalisation also figured prominently in the ideological discussion in the social-democratic ranks.

In some of the documents adopted by social-democratic parties subsequent to the Frankfurt Declaration the nationalisation of key industries was recognised as an essential prerequisite for the attainment of socialist goals.<sup>1</sup> However, such theses were rarely to be found in statements made by social-democratic parties in those years. The views of those ideologists who opposed the socialisation of the basic means of production prevailed.

In his speech at the Sixth Socialist International Congress, J. G. Voogd, a Dutch Socialist, said: "The most important question for Socialists is no longer who owns the means of production in society, but how people live in society."<sup>2</sup> Jules Moch, former Chairman of the French Socialist Party's Committee on Doctrinal Questions, also argued against nationalisation being regarded as a means of reaching socialist goals and "a remedy for all social ills".<sup>3</sup>

What arguments did the social-democratic ideologists put forward to substantiate their point of view?

In their opinion, nationalisation per se does not automatically lead to socialism. One could eliminate private ownership by making private property a possession of the state without creating a socialist society.

Another argument was that the nationalisation effected in a number of Western European countries after the Second World War did not come up to expectation. Jules Moch, for instance, referring to the French experience, noted that nationalisation had

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, the Programme of the Finnish Social-Democratic Party adopted in 1952.

<sup>2</sup> *SH*, No. 1-2, 1960, p. 34.

<sup>3</sup> *SH*, No. 13-14, 1961, p. 212.



failed to improve the position of the workers and to correct the ills besetting French society.<sup>1</sup>

There can be no doubt that the nationalisation of enterprises in France, just as in other countries, has failed to remedy "all social ills" because it was carried out by a bourgeois state. As a result, the nationalised enterprises became the property of the bourgeois state, i.e., a form of state-monopoly, rather than public property. It is only natural that this kind of nationalisation could not radically change the position of the workers in society, improve their living and working conditions and stop their exploitation by big capital and the monopolies. The fact that nationalisation carried out by the bourgeois state has failed to solve these tasks cannot, therefore, serve as an argument against socialist nationalisation, whose nature, goals and tasks are radically different.

The leaders of the Socialist International would also frequently employ the following argument: In the past, the socialisation of the means of production was deemed important since the power wielded by the owners of the means of production was uncontrolled. Nowadays, they held, the power of private owners was no longer unlimited; on the contrary, it was considerably restricted by the "counterpower" of trade unions. Moreover, they argued, workers often participated in running production, while special legislation limited the possibilities for creating monopoly groups in industry. This, they contended, restricted the authority of private owners to a still greater extent.

During the ideological debate prompted by the adoption of the Frankfort Declaration, the leaders of many social-democratic parties vigorously promulgated its basic principles, thus paving the way for the revision of the individual party programmes in the spirit of the Declaration. In this connection, it is important to take into consideration that in the early 1950s, when the policy-making declaration of the Socialist International was being drafted, the leaders of some social-democratic parties, cognizant of the sentiment of the rank-and-file party members and the working people as a whole, felt they were unable to revise their party programmes and incorporate in them such new language as would signal a rejection of some of the demands traditionally

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

advanced by the working class. However, what they could not afford doing with respect to the individual party programmes, they did with regard to the Declaration of the Socialist International. As a result, in the late 1950s the socialist ideologists, in their drive to have the programmes of social-democratic parties revised, were able to refer to the language of the Frankfort Declaration, indicating that the programmes of SI member parties had come to run counter to the International's official positions. That this was used to justify the revision of party programmes was acknowledged, for instance, by the leader of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, Erich Ollenhauer, in his speech at the SPD Congress held in Bad Godesberg in November 1959.<sup>1</sup> Bruno Pittermann, Chairman of the Austrian Socialist Party,<sup>2</sup> and some other top Social-Democrats<sup>3</sup> spoke to the same effect.

The new programmes adopted by socialist parties in the 1950s and early 1960s were indicative of a further retreat of the Socialist International member parties from their former positions. The new programmes mirrored a drive towards the "deideologisation" of the social-democratic movement and its policy-making principles. Clarifying the meaning of this drive, Willi Eichler, Chairman of the SPD Programme Committee, wrote: "What is meant by deideologisation is, generally speaking, the fact that a party rejects an integral doctrine which is dogmatically based on certain political goals. Such deideologisation with respect to the programme has actually occurred in the SPD".<sup>4</sup>

Subsequently, social-democratic leaders took pains to justify their repudiation of an integral doctrine, claiming that this step enabled them to break off with the dogmatism of the past, when they had held Marxist views on certain problems of the working-class and social-democratic movement. Deideologisation, they contended, was designed to secure for social-democratic parties the freedom of creative search and to help them enrich their ideology with elements borrowed from other doctrines.

Having adopted "ideological neutrality" as proclaimed in the Frankfort Declaration, some of the parties went even further than

<sup>1</sup> See: *SI*, No. 48, 1959, p. 737.

<sup>2</sup> See: *SI*, No. 13, 1960, p. 202.

<sup>3</sup> See: Willi Eichler, *Zur Einführung in den demokratischen Sozialismus*, Verlag Neue Gesellschaft GmbH, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 1972, p. 122.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

the Declaration itself. The Social-Democratic Party of Germany, for instance, in its new, 1959, programme does not even mention Marxism among the sources of "democratic socialism", differing thereby from the Programme of the Socialist International.

The new programmes of social-democratic parties adopted between 1957 and 1962 reflected a considerable shift to the right in the ideological stand taken by social-democracy. Proceeding from the principles of the Frankfurt Declaration, the social-democratic parties eliminated many traditional demands of the working class from their programmes. For instance, the previous programme of the Austrian Socialist Party, adopted in 1926, had recognised class struggle as a means of abolishing bourgeois rule, and even acknowledged that under certain conditions the armed struggle of the workers for power and the dictatorship of the proletariat might be indispensable.

By contrast, the new programme of the Austrian Socialist Party, adopted in 1958, considers neither the armed forms of struggle, nor the dictatorship of the proletariat, nor even class struggle to be essential for eradicating capitalism and establishing socialism.<sup>1</sup> The new programmes of social-democratic parties also reflected a noticeable deviation from the former positions on the question of ownership. They no longer contain clearcut, unequivocal demands to abolish capitalist private ownership and socialise the main means of production, demands which used to be incorporated in the previous policy-making documents of social-democracy, such as the Political Directives of the SPD adopted by its Hannover Congress on May 11, 1946. The latter document stated, among other things, the following: "Today's Germany can no longer tolerate a privately-owned capitalist economy of profit, paying out incomes derived from exploitation, dividends on capital and the ground-rent. The currently prevailing ownership relations are no longer in keeping with the further advance and needs of the society. They have become a most serious obstacle to improvement and progress... Socialisation should start with the natural wealth and the raw materials industry. All the enterprises in the mining, metallurgical and metal-working industries (including materials producing enterprises), the greater part

<sup>1</sup> *Die Österreichische Sozialdemokratie im Spiegel ihrer Programme*, Vienna, 1971, pp. 81-103.

of the chemical and synthetic materials industries, as well as all major undertakings in general, the municipal economy in any form, and all branches of the manufacturing industry which tend to develop into large-scale business, must be socialised."<sup>2</sup>

The political demands advanced by the Social-Democrats ten years later sounded quite different. Although nationalisation and other forms of socialising private property are not ruled out, they are no longer regarded as a decisive means of eliminating the sway of the bourgeoisie and building socialism. Planning, democratic control, participation in management, and the like have again come to the fore, as was the case in the Frankfurt Declaration. Some of the programmes, such as those adopted by the SPD and the Austrian Socialist Party openly recognised the possibility and even necessity of retaining private ownership in certain sectors of the economy.

The 1958 Programme of the Austrian Socialist Party stated: "It is only proceeding from the good of society that the question of which enterprises are to be nationalised will be solved... Small and medium enterprises should by no means be nationalised. As the Austrian economy is predominantly made up of medium and small-scale enterprises, a broad sphere of action will be reserved for private enterprise in future, too."<sup>2</sup>

In those days, *The Times*, summing up, as it were, the results of the campaign to revise social-democratic party programmes, commented that over the past decade practically all the European socialist parties, as well as a number of parties outside Europe, had revised their programmes and that almost all of them had abandoned the old idea of establishing public ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange.

The campaigns to revise party programmes were conducted not only under the slogan of "deideologisation" (i.e., the repudiation of Marxism and retreat from clearly defined, class-oriented positions), but also under the slogan of reshaping socialist parties into organisations of "all working people" or even those of "the whole of the people". In this, too, the ideologists of individual

<sup>2</sup> *Dokumente zur parteipolitischen Entwicklung in Deutschland seit 1945*, Vol. 3, Part 2, Dokumentenverlag Dr. Herbert Wendler und Co., Berlin, 1963, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Österreichische Sozialdemokratie im Spiegel ihrer Programme*, pp. 90-91.

parties proceeded from the ideas formulated in the Frankfort Declaration. They justified their slogans by the need to broaden the social-democratic parties' narrow social base and to win over to their side the representatives of other social classes and groups. They contended that regarding the working class as the sole buttress of the socialist parties was tantamount to erecting obstacles in their way towards enhancing their influence, winning elections, gaining a majority in parliaments and establishing "socialist governments".

However, there is every evidence that in calling to transcend the "narrow" limits of a "class-based party" many social-democratic leaders were intent not on winning over as many workers as possible to the side of the Social-Democrats, but on gaining popularity with broader masses at the cost of rejecting Marxist ideology and their party's class nature. It is small wonder that the bourgeois press unequivocally approved of the social-democratic parties' rejection of a class-oriented stand and their advocacy of the idea of a "people's party".

Thus, when revising the programmes of individual social-democratic parties, the right-wing Socialists, determined to impose their views on the SI member parties, relied heavily on the language of the Socialist International's Programme. The theses on "democratic socialism" formulated in the Frankfort Declaration were almost word for word incorporated in the new programmes of many parties. The shift to the right mirrored in the programmes can be described as one largely prompted by the policy-making principles of the International. S. Levenberg, a member of the SI Bureau, wrote in his article devoted to the tenth anniversary of the Frankfort Declaration: "This programme . . . has greatly influenced the ideas and policies of many Labour parties during the last decade, of parties in government and parties in opposition."<sup>1</sup>

The declaration "The World Today—the Socialist Perspective", adopted at the Oslo Conference of the Socialist International in June 1962, is the most important SI policy-making document of the 1960s.

The preparation of this document was spurred by the 1960 Moscow Conference of representatives of 81 communist and

workers' parties. The Conference made an important contribution to the study of the topical questions of the working-class and national liberation movements. It profoundly analysed the key tendencies in social development, the world revolutionary process and the mainsprings of social progress and the revolutionary transformation of the world. The Conference documents had a great impact on the working-class and democratic organisations in many countries. They provided the working people with a rich, truly revolutionary programme of the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

In this context, the leaders of the Socialist International decided to get about drafting their own programme. Counterposed to the communist programme, it was intended to stem the influence of communist ideas and consolidate the position of Social-Democrats in the developed capitalist and developing countries. The document was to sum up the results of world development in the ten years since the Frankfort Congress and map out a programme for solving problems of concern both to the working people in the advanced capitalist countries and to the newly-free nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Socialist International's ideologists took pains to interpret the events of the preceding decade in such a way as to corroborate the social-democratic concept of mankind's development and the "democratic socialism" doctrine.

At their January 1961 Conference in Salzburg the Social-Democrats decided to counter the Moscow Declaration with a document of their own. Then, the SI Bureau resolved that a manifesto be drawn up and approved at the Seventh SI Congress in Rome in October 1961.

The draft declaration, however, failed to provide a more or less acceptable answer to the problems which worried the working people in the West and the peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America. For this reason, the representatives of Asian and African parties attending the Rome Congress came out against the draft submitted to the Congress. They demanded that the general spirit of the Declaration be changed. The International's leaders responded by toning down some of the points in the Declaration. However, the results failed to satisfy the representatives of African and Asian parties and, above all, the left-wing Socialists from Japan.

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 26, 1961, p. 392.

The organisers of the Congress found themselves in a tight corner: to give up the idea of adopting a declaration would mean showing to the whole world that their seemingly well-conceived and thoroughly-prepared action had failed; to adopt the declaration in the original form would mean displaying outright contempt for the wishes of the Asian and African socialist parties. Some delegates of Western European parties suggested adopting the Declaration as a provisional statement. The proposal was overridden by other leaders of the International, first of all by Hugh Gaitskell, who preferred to have the Declaration amended.

The more sober-minded members of the International could not but realise that what was actually needed was making certain adjustments in the ideology and policy of European social-democracy. "We have to sit down with our old and our new friends," wrote R.H.S. Crossman, "to think out how to apply our Socialist principles on a world scale and how to transform what has so far been a pleasant get-together for European Socialists into a world international."<sup>1</sup>

The new draft, after being discussed by the SI Bureau and supplemented and amended in line with the proposals from the parties, was submitted for the approval of the SI Council at its Oslo session in June 1962. Apparently fearing a repetition of a scandalous failure of the Rome Congress type, the SI leaders decided to win approval for the Declaration not at a congress but at a less representative SI Council conference. Moreover, it so happened that the Oslo conference was not attended by the representatives of those very parties which had offered the strongest opposition to the draft discussed in Rome, i.e., of the parties from African countries and the left-wing Socialists of Japan. This, of course, facilitated the task of the International's leadership in having the declaration "The World Today — the Socialist Perspective" approved.

It should be pointed out that this document is different from the Frankfurt Declaration both in form and content.

The 1962 Declaration is not so much a theoretical programme as a political document. It neither repealed nor replaced the

previous programme of the Socialist International, but merely confirmed many of its basic principles.

The new SI document, just like the draft submitted to the Rome Congress, was patently anti-communist. This is especially evident from the Preamble and the section entitled "Socialism and the Communist Countries". Seeking to discredit the Communists in the eyes of the working people in the capitalist countries and the peoples of the developing states, the authors of the Declaration resorted to all sorts of malicious attacks on socialist countries and communist parties.

The Declaration clearly embellishes the changes which took place in the developed capitalist countries in the 1950s. They are described in the Preamble and the section "Socialism and Industrialised Countries". The title itself is remarkable: what is referred to as simply "industrialised" countries is, in fact, economically developed capitalist countries. This, certainly, helps veil the exploitative nature of capitalism. The beginning of the section is also noteworthy: "The most dynamic impulse towards social change has come in countries where democratic Socialist parties have been able to exert effective influence."<sup>1</sup> This is clearly another way of claiming that today's social-democracy plays the leading role in the most significant progressive social changes in the world.

The leaders of the Socialist International claim that as a result of these changes "the worst excesses of capitalism" have been "rectified", and new forms of ownership and control over production have emerged. The Declaration argues that even when "democratic Socialists" are in opposition, bourgeois parties are forced by public opinion to undertake "socialist measures". This assertion is undoubtedly but a further "elaboration" of the theory of "democratic socialism". Whereas in the past the social-democratic leaders maintained that by being in government they would gradually, without revolutions, and through separate reforms modify capitalism and build socialism, now they contend that even when they are in opposition they will be able to exert pressure upon the governments formed by bourgeois parties, thereby ensuring the attainment of socialist aims. These calculations have proved quite illusory and groundless, however.

<sup>1</sup> *The Guardian*, October 27, 1961, p. 22.

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 24-25, 1962, p. 355.

The social-democratic assessment of capitalism and the prospects for its transformation into socialism was based, among other things, on an incorrect interpretation of the social and economic processes in developed capitalist countries, particularly the development of state-monopoly capitalism and the scientific and technological revolution in the 1950s and 1960s. The nationalisation of a number of industries, the growth of the state sector, greater state interference in the economy, various forms of economic programming and regulation, technical and technological improvements, and a certain rise in the living standard of the working people did, in fact, take place. But this was erroneously interpreted by the social-democratic leaders as the embodiment of their idea of the gradual transformation of capitalism and corroboration of their "democratic socialism" concept.

For instance, Richard Löwenthal, an ideologist of Western social-democracy, contended that the capitalist economic system had considerably changed: "The main problem which for dozens of years underlay the demand for the radical socialist transformation of the economy and society—the severe crises and protracted unemployment generating the indigence and material insecurity of the masses—has proved to be largely, if not fully, resolved."<sup>1</sup>

The events of the 1970s, especially the 1974-1975 crisis, showed these conclusions of social-democratic theorists to be groundless.

As to the new phenomena which have allegedly resulted in the noticeable transformation of capitalism in the West, the leaders of the Socialist International and its parties often refer to the theory of the "managerial revolution". According to this theory, private ownership of the means of production, having allegedly lost its former significance, can no longer provide the basis for big owners' domination of the society. Since capitalists normally do not run the enterprises they own, but instead entrust hired managers with running their businesses for them, real power and control over the economy have passed into the hands of the managers. The latter, as the social-democratic ideologists see it, use their rights in the interests of the entire society, rather than for the benefit of small groups of capitalists.

<sup>1</sup> *Was Bleibt vom Sozialismus*, Hannover, 1968, pp. 16-17.

The record, however, has shown that these views distort the actual state of affairs. Of course, bank directors and managers of large firms and concerns concentrate considerable power in their hands. This power is used, however, not for "the common good" but in the interests of the owners of the means of production—the capitalists. The managers are, in the long run, controlled by the owners and many of them are big owners themselves.

For this reason, private ownership of the main instruments and means of production has not lost its former significance, providing, in the context of the "managerial revolution", the bedrock for the bourgeoisie's economic and, consequently, political supremacy.

The Social-Democrats pinned hopes on the development of the scientific and technological revolution. To quote from "Labour and the Scientific Revolution", a policy statement of the British Labour Party: "The prospect that the scientific revolution opens before us is a working life which is secure and interesting, in a society where machines are subordinate to man; a world in which hardship and suffering are progressively eliminated and the whole range of man's culture is available to enrich the lives of all. This is the true socialist vision which, in the past, want and ignorance have held from our grasp."<sup>1</sup>

It goes without saying that the development of the scientific and technological revolution opens up new vistas for the growth of society's productive forces and for satisfying man's needs. However, under capitalism, the scientific and technological revolution leads not so much to resolving contradictions and ensuring "a working life which is secure and interesting", and eliminating "hardship and suffering", as to the exacerbation of the existing and emergence of new contradictions and to greater difficulties for the working people. This is evidenced by numerous facts in the economic and social life in capitalist countries, especially in the 1970s. The 1962 Declaration contains, along with a highly embellished picture of the state of affairs in the developed capitalist countries, a number of anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist statements. Unlike the 1951 Programme, it is

<sup>1</sup> *A Statement of Policy Approved by the Annual Conference of the Labour Party*, London, 1963, p. 4.

more critical of the capitalist system, describing in greater detail the problems capitalism is unable to cope with. For example, the Declaration mentions "recession", "the increasing concentration of economic power", "gross inequalities in the distribution of wealth and income", the use of capital investment for obtaining "capitalist profit", the division of society into "social classes", etc.<sup>1</sup>

In exposing the evils of capitalism, the authors of the Declaration undoubtedly took into account the sentiments of the working people in their own countries and, especially, those of the progressive forces in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They clearly portrayed "democratic socialism" as a "third road" of social development, different both from existing socialism and capitalism. Hence the patent anti-communism of the Declaration, on the one hand, and the more pronounced criticism of the evils and contradictions of the capitalist system, on the other.

What did the Declaration offer as a means of overcoming the existing evils and solving the grave problems facing capitalist countries? Social-democratic leaders pinned their hopes on various reforms within the limits of the existing political system, i.e., the bourgeois system. They proposed expanded state ownership and control, legislation limiting the power of "private monopolies", "economic and social planning", radical tax reform, fairer distribution of income, greater involvement of the working people in economic and other problems, educational reforms, "economic democracy", and the freedom of the press, radio and television from "undemocratic controls", etc. It goes without saying that the leaders of the Socialist International intended to effect all these changes through reforms and on the basis of "democratic socialism", which, in fact, cannot ensure the radical transformation of the capitalist society and the building of true socialism.

Yet there are certain provisions in the Declaration which mirror the working class's desire to put an end to the omnipotence of big capital and the monopolies and to defend its vital rights. Having certain points in common with the extensive programme of anti-monopoly struggle advanced by the progres-

<sup>1</sup> *SIJ*, No. 24-25, pp. 355-56.

sive forces, among them the communist parties, these theses of the Declaration could be incorporated in a joint platform for united action by the Communists and Socialists.

The Socialist International's stand on the national liberation movement and the developing countries, as well as its approach to international relations and the struggle for world peace and security were very contradictory. The 1962 Declaration contained, along with the SI's old theses, a number of new points: the latter took into account, to an extent, the demands of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and of the peace-loving forces throughout the world.

Assessing the Socialist International's policy-making document of 1962, the International's ideologists proved to be incapable of correctly defining the historical tendencies in social development and of formulating a programme which would meet the vital interests of the working people in the capitalist countries and those of the newly-free nations. Having proclaimed the establishment of "democratic socialism" as their aim, in this document, just as in the Frankfort Declaration, the leaders of the Socialist International failed to suggest methods of struggle which could actually lead to abolishing capitalism and building socialism.

### 3. The Ideological Activity of the Socialist International and Its Member Parties in the 1970s

The early 1970s witnessed a new upsurge in the ideological activity of the Socialist International and its member parties. By virtue of the situation in the world arena and the capitalist countries, ideological problems became a pivot of social-democratic activity and the subject of numerous meetings, conferences and seminars held by many SI parties, including those in Austria, the FRG, France, Great Britain, Belgium, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Finland and Luxembourg. Debates on ideological problems were usually initiated by the left-wing Socialists, primarily of the younger generation. Subsequently, the debate involved prominent social-democratic ideologists, too. In some of the parties the questions under discussion were given wide cov-



erage by the party press and considered at party congresses.

The Socialist International made efforts to stimulate the ideological activity of social-democratic parties and to influence its character and content. An important role here was played by the official organ of the Socialist International, which regularly published the most important documents issued by social-democratic parties, and statements on ideological issues made by the International's top members. Some of the materials it published contained a critical analysis of capitalism and appeals to take more decisive actions to change the existing system.

The ideological debate launched by the Social-Democrats in the 1970s involved practically all parties of the Socialist International and had a considerable impact on the ideological and political posture of both individual parties and the Socialist International as a whole.

In each country, the character and thrust of the debates were different. For all the variety of questions discussed and the diversity of approaches taken in various countries, the debates exhibited a number of common features and tendencies.

Social-Democrats began giving greater priority to ideological problems. Appeals were heard everywhere for the "ideological renovation" and revision of previous programmes and for more radical approaches to emerging problems. All this testified not only to the greater activity of left-wing Socialists but also to certain shifts in the official leadership of the social-democratic parties and the Socialist International from the concept of "deideologisation" to that of "reideologisation".

What gave rise to these tendencies among the social-democrats? Upon analysis, intensive ideological debate, appeals for "ideological renovation", and the switch from "deideologisation" to "reideologisation" were caused not by accidental, transient phenomena but by important and comparatively stable long-term factors in the development of capitalist society and international social-democracy.

Moreover, contrary to the Socialists' widespread illusion that modern capitalism has "improved", "got rid" of its inherent evils and is now able to develop without crises and social upheavals, the capitalist world found itself confronting a severe economic crisis that enhanced the exploitation of the working people

and aggravated social conflicts. "Now everyone can see that one of the main myths created by reformists and bourgeois ideologists has collapsed—the myth that present-day capitalism is able to avert crises. The instability of capitalism is becoming more and more apparent. Promises to make capitalism 'sounder' and to create a 'welfare society' within its framework have obviously failed."

As a result, many Social-Democrats came to doubt the ability of capitalist countries to develop harmoniously and progressively, gradually evolving into a "society of plenty", and, subsequently, into a "society of democratic socialism". They increasingly criticised the capitalist system and the evils and conflicts it engenders. The participants in the debates, especially the left-wingers, emphasised capitalism's inability to satisfy the vital needs of many working people and to solve the urgent problems facing society.

Not only the left-wing Social-Democrats but also sizeable groups of the working people began to understand that only socialism could resolve the problems facing the capitalist world. The growth of anti-capitalist sentiment was also pointed out by some leaders of the Socialist International. Bruno Kreisky wrote: "Everybody expected crises of the 1930s type never to occur again. We were experiencing a boom interrupted by small-scale and short crises. And now, all of a sudden, we face a situation which is not easy to cope with. In these circumstances . . . people turn to socialist ideas again."<sup>2</sup>

Amidst an economic crisis, growing unemployment and insecurity, many Socialists increasingly realised that neither the development of state-monopoly capitalism nor the scientific and technological revolution would in and of themselves be able to guarantee capitalism's transformation into socialism. Olof Palme wrote: "Many people had dreamed that the economic growth engendered by modern technology and research would automatically bring about social justice and security in those countries that were rich already. . . . The enthusiastic talk about industrial

<sup>1</sup> *Documents and Resolutions, XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1976, p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Willy Brandt, Bruno Kreisky, Olof Palme, *Briefe und Gespräche, 1972 bis 1975*, Europäische Verlagsanstalt, Frankfurt-Cologne, 1975, pp. 82-83.

miracles finished... Doubts began to take root.<sup>1</sup> The working people, too, were alarmed by the growing economic might of major monopoly amalgamations and their increasing influence on state bodies, the results of which were felt in everyday life. To make things worse, the mass media were being monopolised, an enormous military and police machinery was being developed, while the right-wing tendencies in the policy pursued by the ruling classes and the danger of neo-fascist movements and coups d'état grew.

The Social-Democrats became increasingly critical of the economic and political system obtaining in capitalist countries, and realised more clearly the limitations of Western democracy and the dominant role of big capital and monopolies in all areas of social life. Tony Benn, a prominent British left-wing Labourite, wrote: "Not just the economic but also the political power of big business, especially the multinationals, has come into the open."<sup>2</sup> He pointed out that while in the 1950s ten major British companies accounted for nearly 20 per cent of the gross national product, by 1979 they provided as much as 46 per cent of the GNP. This enables the monopolies to impose their will both in the economic and political spheres, and to dominate the whole of society. Describing the situation in France, François Mitterrand wrote: "A handful of the privileged possess economic power and through it all other kinds of power: political democracy covers up the deplorable deception, and a class dictatorship is exercised in France under the guise of complaisant institutions."<sup>3</sup>

Such statements are not often heard from leaders of the Socialist International. It is well known that for many years they have in various ways praised Western democracy as being perfect, as the best to be had, as one which can provide the framework for the historical transition of society from capitalism to socialism. But things change and life makes the Social-Democrats more realistic in assessing the situation in capitalist countries.

The worsened crisis of capitalism in the 1970s, the inability of the bourgeois state machinery to stem the numerous difficulties plaguing capitalist economy, the shrinking possibility for so-

cial manoeuvring, the attempts of certain governments to find a way out of crises at the expense of the working masses—all this forced the social-democratic leadership to reassess the nature of the state in Western countries. The concept of the supra-class character of the state which can allegedly facilitate society's transition from capitalism to socialism current in the 1950s and 1960s started to give way to a more realistic understanding of the nature and role of the state, of the necessity to establish the power of the working people to attain social goals. For instance, the leader of the left-wing of the French Socialist Party, Jean-Pierre Chevènement, observed that in the present-day world the state is the main organising factor in society and that in order to go over to socialism it is imperative to gain state power both at the government and all other levels.

The crisis of the 1970s posed the acute question of how to develop the capitalist economy, combat unemployment and inflation and solve other economic and social problems. Many Socialists came to the conclusion that economic development could not be left to private individuals but should be planned instead, in line with the requirements of the entire society, while the free-wheeling effects of the market and profit should be restrained. As Olof Palme put it, "We cannot leave the making of necessary decisions to people governed by the interests of the privately-owned economy. We cannot permit the striving for profit and competitive thinking to be decisive in solving the problems of forming the environment, ensuring jobs or developing technology."<sup>1</sup>

Even those Socialist International leaders who prior to the 1974-1975 crisis had advocated retaining a market economy were compelled to review their stand. For instance, W. Brandt in his 1973 letter to B. Kreisky and O. Palme underscored the "benefits of a market economy" and urged "developing the market and competition forces on as comprehensive a scale as possible". Nonetheless, during his May 1975 meeting with Palme and Kreisky he was compelled to admit that amidst the growing economic crisis "the issue of planned factors becomes more important".<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1974, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Tony Benn, *Arguments for Socialism*. Ed. by Chris Mullin, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1980, pp. 49-50.

<sup>3</sup> Mitterrand, *L'Homme, les idées*, Flammarion, Paris, 1974, p. 70.

<sup>1</sup> W. Brandt, B. Kreisky, O. Palme, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> W. Brandt, B. Kreisky, O. Palme, *op. cit.*, pp. 66, 122.



The left-wing Socialists, particularly in France, Great Britain and the FRG, contended that economic development in the interests of the entire nation was impossible unless the key industries and major monopoly amalgamations were nationalised. They opposed the idea current among the Social-Democrats and many working people that it was possible to ensure the control and use of the means of production in the interests of the whole of society without eliminating private ownership of those means. Tony Benn, for instance, stressed that "the choice is between a growing concentration of private power held in a very few—closely linked—hands, not accountable to the community. Or greater accountability to workers, consumers and to the people—from within the public sector."<sup>1</sup>

The left-wing Socialists insisted that in the future nationalisation should be fundamentally different from the one which had been carried out in the capitalist countries previously. They were justified in noting that that nationalisation had failed to bring about any significant changes in the position and role of the factory and office workers at the enterprises, to change social and economic relations and modify the power structure. Therefore, the paramount problem of nationalisation, according to Benn, should be the development of genuine industrial democracy, i.e., actual participation of workers in running production.

Workers' participation in economic management was widely discussed by Social-Democrats in other countries, too. Left-wing Social-Democrats stressed that in capitalist countries the discrepancy between the growing role of the working class as society's main productive force, its higher cultural level and skills, on the one hand, and the lack of a real possibility for the workers to participate in running the economy, on the other, was becoming more and more pronounced.

Many Socialists were concerned over the concentration of economic power in the hands of the major monopolies limiting the working people's say in making the decisions on their living and working conditions. They criticised the "participation in management" practices in various countries as clearly ineffective in safeguarding the interests of the working people and in limiting the power of the industrialists.

<sup>1</sup> Tony Benn, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

In a number of cases, the results of social-democratic government provoked the serious disillusionment of the rank-and-file Social-Democrats and the broad working masses. In the past, when the leaders of social-democratic parties did not have seats in government, they would justify themselves by referring to the fact that being in opposition they had no opportunity to implement their programme for "socialist restructuring of society". In the 1950s and 1960s, however, many of the social-democratic parties came to power. In some countries (among them Sweden, Great Britain, Austria, Norway, Holland, Denmark, Belgium, Finland and Italy), Social-Democrats gained cabinet seats and sometimes even headed coalition or single-party "socialist" governments. One might have expected them to press forward with their projects. However, they did not build socialism in any one of the countries they led; moreover, they did not take any radical steps towards this end. The notable French Socialist Michel Rocard acknowledged that "up till now ... democratic socialism has confined itself ... to correcting the injustices of capitalism while leaving the system to work more or less as before."<sup>1</sup> G. Nennig, a prominent figure in the Austrian Socialist Party, was even more critical in his assessment of the results of the social-democratic government: "During the Social-Democrats' years in power, both in coalition and in single-party governments, the material inequality in capitalist countries has grown instead of diminishing."<sup>2</sup>

Many Socialists were openly displeased with the role played by certain social-democratic leaders, that of loyal administrators of the capitalist state. They were dissatisfied with the reforms carried out by the social-democratic governments, and demanded more radical programmes and more vigorous action aimed at transforming capitalist society.

The nature and goals of the policy of reform pursued by the social-democratic parties became a special subject of debate in the 1970s. The reforms proposed by the right-wing Socialists were not to affect the foundations of the bourgeois political system and capitalist economy (for this reason they were often re-

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in: *Socialist Affairs*, No. 4, 1980, p. 102.

<sup>2</sup> Heinz Fischer (Ed.), *Rote Markierungen '80*, Europaverlag, Vienna, 1980, p. 136.

ferred to as "system-stabilising reforms"). The reforms advocated by the left-wing Socialists, referred to as "system-changing reforms", constituted a programme for a sweeping overhaul of the entire economic and social system. In the opinion of their proponents, these reforms would lead to establishing the rule of the working people, instituting public ownership and building socialism.

"...Public ownership, economic planning and improved and more egalitarian social services, essential as all these are in providing the basis for further advance, [cannot] alone provide the answer," wrote Tony Benn, "There must be further fundamental changes to liberate people and allow them to lead fuller and more satisfying lives."<sup>1</sup>

Some Social-Democrats, particularly the left-wingers, began to express doubts concerning their parties' policy-making directives and the "democratic socialism" concept. They pointed out the inability of social-democracy to do away with capitalism, inability due not only to the unwillingness of certain leaders to wage a vigorous struggle for socialism but also to the groundlessness of social-democratic concepts of the transformation of capitalism into socialism. For instance, Gr. Bjerregaard, one of the leaders of the left-wing faction of the Social-Democratic Party of Denmark, wrote in an article published in the party's journal *Ny Politik*: "Do we actually believe in all seriousness that democratic socialism can be established through a democratic procedure or do we only declare this for show? I, for one, am not sure that we shall be allowed to introduce socialism freely through the ballot. Democratic socialism is not a feasible goal."<sup>2</sup>

Questioning the concept of democratic socialism and pointing to the eclectic and inconsistent character of some ideological and political principles governing modern social-democracy, many left-wing Socialists began to resort more and more frequently to the Marxist methods of studying capitalism. They primarily analyse the causes and results of the economic crisis and the exacerbation of socio-economic contradictions, means of overcoming the existing difficulties and ways of moving from capitalism to socialism.

Despite the attempts of the right-wing Socialists to discredit Marxism and to prove its "obsolescence", Marxist doctrine enjoyed

<sup>1</sup> Tony Benn, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> *Ny Politik*, No. 9, 1975, p. 10.

increasing popularity in the workers' and democratic organisations. Many of the recent concepts formulated by the left-wing Socialists in the FRG, France, Italy, Belgium, Denmark, Finland and Japan were elaborated under the influence and on the basis of the Marxist analysis of capitalism. Thus, the Young Socialists, an organisation functioning within the German SPD, openly proclaimed itself a "Marxist faction" of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany. Marxist tendencies make themselves felt in the views held by the organisation of the French left-wing Socialists.

The crisis of the 1970s shattered many of the working people's illusions about the prospects for the development of capitalist society. The latter proved to be unable to cope with such pressing problems as unemployment, inflation, crisis-free economic development and the rational use of natural resources.

In this context, the efforts made by the monopolies and the bourgeois state to stem the difficulties at the expense of the working people, by encroaching on their living standard and cutting social expenditure were repulsed by the working people and trade unions.

This could not fail to influence social-democracy. The left-wing forces within its ranks became much more active. The left-wingers criticised the capitalist system and urged the social-democratic parties to be more independent of the bourgeois forces in formulating their policies and to be more persistent in protecting the interests of the working people and demanding a radical solution of vital problems. The ideological activity of the left-wing Socialists was spearheaded against right-wing opportunist concepts in the ideology and policy of social-democracy and at elaborating more clearcut programmes of struggle for socialism needed to put the socialist parties back on class, Marxist positions.

However, the reasons behind the ideological activity of the leaders of many social-democratic parties and the Socialist International as a whole were different. They sought to direct the ideological discussions in such a way as to defend the former course of the social-democratic parties, prevent the consolidation of left-wing forces and the spread of Marxist ideas, and to perpetuate their dominance in their parties and their influence among the broad working masses. While talking about "ideological revival", they made every effort to channel the discussion of ideological and political problems into old social-reformist concepts. In organising

debates, providing an outlet for criticism by the malcontents, and pretending to be willing to heed the demands of the masses, they did everything possible to keep the basic principles of social-reformism from being revised. Many of the "new" proposals advanced by the social-democratic ideologists were a mere repetition of the old ideas advocated by the right-wing Socialists.

The leaders of the Socialist International and of many of its member parties are extremely contradictory in formulating their attitudes: on the one hand, they criticise the evils of capitalism, noting that it leads to the concentration of economic power in the hands of monopolies, primarily multinational ones, makes for irrational overproduction, increases inflation, boosts unemployment, pollutes the environment, fosters inequality in the distribution of income and property, turns people into mere consumers, etc. On the other hand, however, they continue their policy of the 1950s and 1960s in advocating methods and vehicles of social-democratic activity which can never lead to radical change and in fact serve to perpetuate the political and economic underpinnings of the capitalist system.

The right-wing leaders of social-democracy continue to defend the bourgeois state, claiming that any attempt to eliminate it is bound to lead to chaos. Thus, H.-J. Vogel, one of the top leaders of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, wrote: "Those who advocate the elimination of the existing state do not realise that only the state can make changes in the complex mechanisms of the present-day reality and continuously direct their development towards new goals. Any direct interference of the insurgent masses in these mechanisms would inevitably lead to chaos, violence, a decline in the material well-being, above all, of the broad masses, and to restricted civil freedoms."<sup>1</sup>

As is clear from Vogel's statement, the supporters of such concepts, while defending the kind of state now obtaining in Western countries, are actually in fear of the masses. Unlike the left-wingers, they feel that the possibility for any positive change is linked to the state and the ruling elite alone, and not the working masses.

The right-wing leaders resolutely oppose the demands of the

<sup>1</sup> *Beiträge zur Theoriediskussion II*, Verlag J.H.W. Dietz Nachf. GmbH, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 1974, pp. 67-68.

left-wing Socialists to reject the theory and practice of class collaboration and to return to the positions of class struggle. Unable to deny the existence of class contradictions and conflicts in society, the right-wing Socialists contend that they should be resolved not through class struggle but through co-operation among classes and social partnership. For instance, the German social-democratic authors Gerhard Wuthe and Heinz Junker in their work *Democratic Society, Consensus and Conflict* declare that the goal of "democratic socialism" consists in closing the gap between the interests of the capitalists and the working people by new forms of collaboration.<sup>1</sup> This point of view was supported by Helmut Schmidt, who recognised the inevitability of conflicts in capitalist society and thought that they should be settled by compromise, on the basis of social partnership. The primary task of the social-democratic parties, the trade unions and the state, he stressed, consisted in ensuring social peace. He claimed that social peace had made it possible for the FRG to score considerable successes in economic and social areas.<sup>2</sup>

Curiously, certain social-democratic leaders realise that amidst the growing social conflicts and the intensive class struggle unfolding in capitalist countries today, it is impossible to deny the necessity for the workers to engage in class struggle to safeguard their social gains. At the same time, they seek to prove that social partnership is none other than class struggle waged in present-day circumstances. As Bruno Kreisky has stated, "social partnership is an improved form of class struggle."<sup>3</sup>

While rejecting the demands of left-wing Socialists that the social-democratic parties return to the positions of class struggle and the revolutionary methods of transforming capitalist society, right-wing Socialists go out of their way to defend their former course based on the reformist theory and practice. "Reform," declares Helmut Schmidt, "is the main political category."<sup>4</sup>

Aware of the displeasure of many Social-Democrats with the

<sup>1</sup> G. Wuthe, H. Junker, *Demokratische Gesellschaft. Konsensus und Konflikt*, Part I, Günter Olzog Verlag, Munich-Vienna, 1975, pp. 149-50.

<sup>2</sup> R. Löwenthal (Ed.), *Demokratischen Sozialismus in den achtziger Jahren*, Europäische Verlagsanstalt, Cologne, Frankfurt on the Main, 1979, p. 78.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 221.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

unsatisfactory results of reformist activity, the leaders of the Socialist International and its parties made every effort to instil the idea that individual reforms can be instrumental not only in achieving gradual improvement within the framework of the capitalist system but also in radically transforming society and progressing from capitalism to socialism.

This again reveals one of the essential contradictions underlying the social-democratic stand. The right-wing Socialists regard ensuring, attaining and preserving class peace and social partnership as their most important task. They resolutely reject the possibility of using any violence against capitalist forces. In these circumstances only such reforms and changes are possible which are agreed to by the capitalists, the owners of the chief means and instruments of production. However, history has shown that the ruling, privileged stratum of the community has never consented to any reforms without being pressured, i.e., without some sort of violence. Pinning their hopes on reform pursued in the context of social peace, the social-democratic leaders impede radical changes which could lead to the elimination of capitalism and building of socialism.

Nowadays, both left-wing and right-wing Socialists tend to indulge in talking and writing about economic democracy and the participation of working people in the management of production. Unlike the left-wing Socialists, the right-wing party members interpret this participation as something limited. As a matter of fact, they do not talk about ensuring real participation of the workers in management (which would enable them to control production and influence economic development), but focus instead on forms of participation that would not restrict the rights and the freedom of action of the owners of the means of production. In this connection, R. Gmüser, the Austrian Socialist Party's expert on economic problems, said: "The efforts to create a world of labour worthy of man cannot be successful unless democratisation at enterprises goes hand in hand with democratic collaboration between employers and workers' organisations."<sup>1</sup> The former leader of the British Labour Party James Callaghan spoke in the same vein in even more precise terms. There is still much to be done to meet the demand for the participation of

employees in running production, he stressed. Workers' participation should supplement the activity of the managers and not replace or hamper it.<sup>1</sup>

Social-democratic leaders took considerable efforts to find ways of resolving the various problems which became especially acute in the 1970s. Many Socialists regard unemployment as the number one problem for the workers' and social-democratic movements. According to Olof Palme, this problem is a manifestation of the bankruptcy of the socio-political system in capitalist countries, and the capitalist economy is in no position to solve it.<sup>2</sup> Nonetheless, when it comes to elaborating concrete programmes of action for social-democratic parties and governments, the leaders of social-democracy close their eyes to the necessity to radically transform this system, believing that the solution lies in all kinds of measures to be taken within the framework of the existing socio-political system—that very system which, in their own words, is unable to eradicate unemployment.

The leaders of social-democracy cannot ignore the demands of the left-wing forces to revise the policy-making ideological and theoretical principles of social-democratic parties. However, while recognising the need for change, they by no means intend to surrender their former positions. What they have in mind is simply amending and supplementing the doctrine of "democratic socialism", with all its basic principles remaining intact.

At the same time, the leadership of the Socialist International and its parties could not ignore the situation that took shape in the 1970s both internationally and in individual capitalist countries. They modified their positions accordingly and worked out various short- and long-term programmes, allowing for the new realities in world development and the demands of the working people and left-wing social-democracy.

The advocacy of "ideological neutrality" and the pragmatic approach to charting the policy of social-democratic parties resulted in both theorists and politicians finding themselves unarmed in terms of theory and practice. Many Social-Democrats realised that light-heartedness in the theoretic area rendered them helpless in the face of pressing political, economic and social

<sup>1</sup> *Rote Markierungen* '60, p. 89.

<sup>1</sup> See: R. Löwenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> See: R. Löwenthal, *op. cit.*, pp. 103-01.

problems. Their influence among the masses and their participation in governments were seriously imperiled. The reasons, essence and implications of crises had to be explained and new questions answered. The latter included recession, soaring unemployment, continued inflation, the increasingly endangered environment, etc. Hence the calls for a more profound insight into the processes taking place in the world, for a return to more definite ideological positions, and for a more precise and workable programme.<sup>1</sup>

The social-democratic leaders tried to overcome the serious difficulties which had emerged in a number of countries in the relations between the social-democratic parties and substantial groups, and sometimes the majority, of workers. It is a known fact that one of the reasons for rejecting Marxism and advocating "ideological neutrality" was to win the middle, primarily petty-bourgeois, strata of the population over to the side of social-democratic parties. This was also expected to be achieved by turning the social-democratic parties of the working class into "people's parties". Many social-democratic leaders did in fact gain the votes of representatives of the middle strata and win seats in the government. However, while winning over to their side those who had earlier kept to the right of social-democracy, the socialist parties largely forfeited the confidence and support of the workers, as well as their political authority in society. Throughout the 1970s, this was made manifest by the elections to the local organs of government and national parliaments in Great Britain, the FRG, Sweden, Denmark, Holland and a number of other countries. Things reached a point where social-democratic leaders and governments in some countries, such as Great Britain and the FRG, found themselves in open conflict with the trade unions. The demands and programmes formulated by the trade unions (usually more conservative than the social-democratic parties) in certain important areas of domestic and foreign policy now proved to be more radical than those advanced by the Social-Demo-

<sup>1</sup> Graphic examples of this can be found in Bruno Kreisky's letter to Willy Brandt and Olof Palme. In his letter of April 15, 1975 Kreisky wrote: "The understanding of the problems facing us develops faster than our ability to answer the question of what is to become of 'our world'. Therefore, the world outlook question arises again before us" (see: W. Brandt, B. Kreisky, O. Palme, *op. cit.*, p. 115).

crats. The leaders of the latter, cognizant of this fact, were compelled to reconsider some of their positions.

The renunciation of Marxism, the advocacy of "ideological neutrality", "deideologisation" and the idea of a "people's party" resulted in many workers no longer seeing any essential difference between the social-democratic and the liberal bourgeois parties. On many political issues, particularly in the struggle against communist parties and socialist countries, the right-wing Socialists often aligned themselves with the bourgeoisie.

In their turn, the bourgeois parties, prompted by a desire to gain more votes and urged on by the masses, included certain principles from social-democratic programmes in their election manifestoes. This almost completely obscured, for the politically inexperienced voter especially, the difference between the social-democratic parties and the conservative ones. The rapprochement between the Social-Democrats and the liberal bourgeoisie proved to be detrimental for the former. Social-democratic leaders were therefore compelled to try and prove that their stand was essentially different from that of the bourgeoisie and that their concept of reforms was, in content and aims, unlike the reforms propagated by the liberal bourgeois parties.

The upsurge in the ideological activity of the social-democratic parties was also caused by the necessity to repulse the attacks of the right-wing bourgeois parties. The right-wing bourgeois forces were seriously concerned over the desire of the Social-Democrats to take an independent stand on a number of issues and over a certain shift to the left in the latter's ideological and policy-making guidelines. Regarding this as a threat to their class positions, they intensified their attacks on social-democratic parties in a bid to undermine the latter's influence among the masses.

Bourgeois ideologists shunned no means in attacking the Social-Democrats and often resorted to patently false arguments. In the countries where the influence of anti-communism was still very strong, such as Great Britain, the FRG, Austria and Sweden, they evoked fear and mistrust of social-democracy by presenting its attitudes as being pro-communist.

Among the bourgeois ideologists' and politicians' favourite arguments was that social-democracy's goal, socialism, ran counter to the cause of freedom and democracy, while the Socialists' plans to limit the uncontrolled power of the monopolies and introduce

a measure of control over the activity of private enterprises and certain elements of economic planning endangered individual freedom, initiative and creative ability. "Freedom or Socialism" was the chief slogan of the West German bourgeois parties in the 1976 election campaign.

The April 1978 conference of the right-wing bourgeois parties of the EEC member countries resulted in the establishment of a European Democratic Union. According to Margaret Thatcher, leader of Britain's Conservative Party, the conferees were "brought together by a common threat to freedom from Marxism" which, as she said in a different context, "was clearly visible even behind social-democracy". She charged that the Socialist International constantly worked towards socialism, and now "it was up to the parties which stood for freedom and democracy [the right-wing bourgeois parties—*N.S.*] to work out a joint concept".<sup>1</sup>

These circumstances made the leaders of the social-democratic parties enter into public polemics with the right-wing bourgeois theorists to defend the basic principles of their ideology and policy and to show to the masses that the Socialists were genuine fighters for freedom and democracy.

Talking about the consolidation of the right-wing forces in a number of capitalist countries, primarily the United States and Great Britain, and their invigoration in other Western countries, Joop den Uyl, a leader of the Dutch Labour Party, pointed out that the attacks of the right-wingers "on almost all the basic ideas of [democratic—*N.S.*] socialism" had intensified. He concluded that "European Social-Democrats should be extra ready to fight."<sup>2</sup>

Aware of the fact that the bourgeoisie was taking advantage of the masses being politically and ideologically ill-informed, the social-democratic ideologists began to talk about the need for political education for the working people. Thus, Karl Czernetz, emphasised the need for greater efforts towards shaping socialist consciousness as an important step towards the victory of democratic socialism.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 4, 1978, p. 101.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 4, 1981, p. 145.

<sup>3</sup> *Die Zukunft*, No. 9, 1972, p. 5.

The social-democratic parties started to devote more attention to propagating the ideas of "democratic socialism" among the working people. They were now taught in the party educational network designed for party functionaries and rank-and-file members. Some parties set up special institutions to this end. The SPD of Germany founded the Institute for the Problems of Democratic Socialism, the Socialist Party of Austria—the Karl Renner Political Academy, and the French Socialist Party—the Institute for Socialist Studies. Seeking to explain the unsatisfactory results of their administration, the inability of social-democratic governments to solve the problems facing them and fulfil their pre-election promises, the leaders of social-democratic parties began to argue that this was not the fault of their parties and governments, but rather that of the social-political system which, by limiting the area of social-democratic activity, prevented them from fulfilling all that was envisaged in the programmes and promised to the working people.

International detente had a great impact upon the social-democratic leadership.

In the cold war years the right-wing forces managed to intimidate a considerable section of the population, among them workers, with the bogus dangers of "communist dictatorship". In this context, the Social-Democrats sought to draw a dichotomy between themselves and the Communists. They achieved this largely by deleting from their policy-making documents such statements as might have been taken to concur with the principles advocated by the communist parties.

Detente considerably reduced these misgivings and created propitious conditions for throwing away the lumber which had been included in social-democratic programmes under the influence of the cold war.

In the cold war years the Social-Democrats maintained close co-operation with the bourgeois parties and were especially susceptible to their influence. In order to maintain this co-operation in the face of "external dangers", they made ideological concessions to the bourgeoisie, too. With detente it became more obvious how dangerous for social-democracy its close alliance with the bourgeoisie was, to what extent it checked the initiative of the Social-Democrats and prevented them from shaping and pursuing an independent policy. Hence the efforts made by the so-



cial-democratic leaders to end their dependence on the bourgeoisie and appear before the masses as an independent, self-sufficient political force capable of waging a vigorous struggle for the interests of the working people, for both the democratic and socialist goals proclaimed by their programmes.

Such were some of the reasons behind the stepped up ideological activity of the social-democratic leaders and the leftward shifts in the goals and methods of their work. What motivated the right-wing and centrist socialist leadership to incorporate more radical demands in their documents was essentially different from what motivated the actions of the left-wing Socialists. Objectively, the former, too, developed a general tendency towards rejecting the bankrupt cold war approaches and elaborating more realistic and radical programmes.

This was reflected in the new policy-making documents adopted by some social-democratic parties in the mid- and late 1970s. For example, the New Belgian Socialist Charter adopted in November 1974 sharply criticised capitalism as a system incapable of coping with the economic crisis, conducive to the greater concentration of power in the hands of the privileged minority and thereby perpetuating "the exploitation of those who live from their work by those who live from the work of others". The Charter states: "Only socialism is capable of protecting humanity from the perils which beset it." The programme emphasised that the Belgian Socialist Party intended to work for the radical transformation of capitalism and therefore "refuses to be integrated within present-day society".<sup>1</sup>

The ideological and policy-making directives of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (PSOE) sound quite radical. The resolution adopted at the Party Congress in December 1976 declares: "The PSOE defines itself as socialist because its programme and its action go further than the capitalist method of production by enabling the working class to take both political and economic power, and to socialise the means of production, distribution and exchange. We understand socialism as an end and the process which leads to this end. Our ideals lead us to reject any road that accommodates capitalism or its simple reform."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 5, 1974, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 2, 1977, p. 58.

The programme of the British Labour Party adopted in 1973 also included some new statements mirroring the interests of the working people and the demands of the left-wing forces. It described the economic system of Great Britain as capitalist and stressed that even the broadest social reforms carried out within its framework could not insure fundamental changes in the relations of power dominant in British society. The programme declared that in order to eradicate inequality, and ensure economic planning in the national interest, economic power should be handed over to the masses. The transfer to the state of those branches of production on which economic growth is based, primarily in the manufacturing industry, was declared a priority task. The Labour Programme adopted in 1976 reiterated and intensified the demands for anti-monopoly reforms formulated in the 1973 Programme. They included the demand to establish control over the major private companies in 32 of the most important branches of industry and trade and to strengthen state control over 100 major private firms. The government, said the programme, must have the right to pass over to state ownership those firms which failed to meet their commitments to the workers and society.

The policy statements of the French Socialist Party are the most radical ones to date. This is reflected in the document "The Project of Society: for Socialism", adopted by the Conference of French Socialists held in October 1974. The document contains severe criticism of capitalism and proclaims the struggle for socialism an immediate task. It points out that despite capitalism's adaptability "its main contradiction, viz. the opposition of the interests of the minority who rule society's life and the interests of the vast majority who are exploited and oppressed, persists."<sup>1</sup>

The document stresses that the struggle of the working people against the capitalist system is becoming more vigorous and the class struggle, instead of dying down, is growing and acquiring new and new forms. "The Socialists did not invent class struggle, it is a fact. There is every evidence that this mainspring of social change has not ceased to play its role even though the boun-

<sup>1</sup> *Pour le socialisme. Le livre des assises du socialisme*, Editions Stock, Paris, 1974, p. 17.



daries between classes are changing,"<sup>1</sup> reads the document. The programme of the French Socialists declares that today socialism should not be regarded as something remote, but rather as an immediate goal of the working people's struggle. As the French Socialists see it, the radical restructuring of the economy and the transfer of the key instruments and means of production into public, collective ownership are among the main ways of attaining this goal. "Self-governing socialism, which the French socialist movement is heading for, will be grounded in various forms of collective ownership (state, regional, communal ownership, the property of various associations, etc.) and on as decentralised power as possible."<sup>2</sup>

The 1974 document points out that the Socialists cannot let the capitalist state retain its present form because this would mean perpetuating bourgeois rule, renouncing democracy and posing a constant threat to socialism. Therefore, radical changes in the existing state are needed. One of the principal tasks is to seize the state apparatus without which the transformation of the entire society is impossible. The left, upon gaining power, says the Programme, should not temporise and refrain from taking urgent measures to change the very nature of power. The basic principles formulated in the 1974 document of the French Socialists were concretised in the "Socialist project" for the immediate future, adopted at the January 1980 conference of the French Socialists and entitled "The Party Charter".

Thus, the social-democratic parties' new programmes incorporate numerous anti-monopoly and, sometimes, anti-capitalist demands. This lays the groundwork for elaborating a platform of common action by all left-wing democratic forces. Such radical demands are not something accidental, but a result of changes in the objective conditions of the working peoples' lives, in the activity of social-democratic parties, in the attitudes of their rank-and-file members, and in the consciousness of the working people. This creates propitious conditions enabling the social-democratic masses to be more active in the struggle for attaining the democratic and socialist goals of the workers' movement. The radical demands and plans formulated in the documents of some social-

ist and social-democratic parties can become a real programme of struggle involving millions of workers.

It goes without saying that the degree of radicalisation of the programmatic demands put forward by social-democratic parties in various countries is different. The most appreciable shifts are displayed by the policy-making documents of the French Socialist Party. This is not to say that other social-democratic parties are prepared to take the same stand as the French Socialist Party. However, the French example is highly significant, as it reveals the potential inherent in the social-democratic movement and shows that under certain favourable conditions (stronger anti-capitalist tendencies in the workers' movement, the existence of a strong and influential communist party, political crisis suffered by the bourgeois parties and the governments they head, etc.) some socialist and social-democratic parties may considerably modify their stands. They will thus be able to give up the idea of maintaining class co-operation, supporting the bourgeois state and effecting certain reforms within the framework of the capitalist system in favour of the idea of class struggle and radical transformation of the existing state and the entire capitalist system.

The leftward shifts in the ideological and policy principles of a number of socialist and social-democratic parties did not fail to influence the Socialist International.

The Socialist International started to pay more attention to problems of greatest concern to the workers. In the context of economic crisis and its consequences the Socialist International repeatedly dealt with the questions of economic democracy, unemployment, planning, the activity of transnational corporations, etc. The leaders of the Socialist International sought to pool their efforts to elaborate a programme which would be instrumental in fighting unemployment. The issue was examined in detail at the European Conference of West European Social-Democratic Parties and Trade Union Confederations on Economic Policy and Employment held in Oslo on April 1-3, 1977. "The Conference agreed," its Resolution stated, "that full employment must be the primary aim of economic policy... It is unacceptable that a modern democratic society cannot provide the opportunity of stable and secure employment for all its citizens... Employment is a human right."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pour le socialisme... p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 2, 1977, p. 55.

Among the International's initiatives was a Conference on Youth Employment held in November 1977 in Zurich and sponsored jointly by the Socialist International, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the International Council of Social-Democratic Women, and the International Union of Socialist Youth. As Bernt Carlsson, General Secretary of the Socialist International, remarked at the 14th SI Congress, it was the first time that the Socialist International sponsored a conference together with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

The Socialist International has given much attention to analysing the activity of the multinationals and elaborating a common approach of social-democratic parties to this problem. An ad hoc working group was appointed to study the issue and draft necessary recommendations. It is significant that the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions was active in the group's work. The ICFTU made some concrete proposals for working-class organisations both at the national and international levels and submitted them for the consideration of the Bureau of the Socialist International in October 1978 and the 14th Congress of the Socialist International in November 1978.

The 14th SI Congress adopted a special resolution which stressed the growing importance of the multinationals in the world economy and "the urgent need to control the activities of these organisations".<sup>1</sup> The Socialist International, says the Resolution, fully supports the intention of trade unions, co-operative societies and their international organisations to create a force which would counteract the MNCs. The SI confirmed its support for the trade unions, parties, governments and international organisations in their efforts to exercise stricter control over the activity of the multinational corporations.

The resolutions of the Socialist International also contained general assessments of the situation in capitalist countries and ways of overcoming the existing difficulties and contradictions. For instance, the resolution of the 13th SI Congress (1976) on the political situation stressed: "The crisis in world capitalism, its consequences for the working class and the tensions resultant in international relations all clearly show that socialism, the har-

binger of hope and justice for all peoples, is the only alternative to political systems that generate conflict, disorder and injustice."<sup>2</sup>

The discussion held during the 14th and 15th congresses of the Socialist International (convened in 1978 and 1980, respectively) also focussed on various phenomena inherent in the crisis. The resolution of the 15th Congress states: "This ongoing crisis is evidence of the incapacity of the existing economic order to provide both jobs and a just distribution of wealth." The participants were justified in noting that the crisis entailed "attacks on human rights, the liquidation of democratic freedoms, the trade in armaments, and acts of military intervention and war". The leaders of the Socialist International also pointed out that "the conservatives' answer to this crisis is to impose austerity on the great mass of people, to induce deliberately even more unemployment and to dismantle parts of the welfare state."<sup>3</sup>

Nonetheless, while stating the incapacity of capitalism to solve the problem of unemployment and other urgent problems facing society, the Socialist International proved unable to formulate an effective programme of its own and its member parties' activities, as well as of the activity of trade unions and other organisations under their influence. It failed to suggest measures which would liberate the people from the power of capital, help to eliminate it and establish a new, socialist system. For instance, at its 13th Congress, held in 1976, the Socialist International, charting the "strategy" for ensuring full employment, reduced the task to state-monopoly regulation measures (increased production, purposeful investment policies, extended social areas of economic activity, etc.). Subsequent resolutions were of a similar nature. For instance, formulating the documents of the 15th Congress, the leaders of the Socialist International rejected the austere measures suggested by the conservatives, and chose the following approach: "We will meet this challenge as we overcome some of the destructive tendencies of capitalism in the past. We propose democratically planned structural change which will help eliminate the basic causes of the crisis."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1, 1977, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1, 1981, p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1979, p. 28.

Such declarations show that what the leaders of the Socialist International have in mind are only certain modifications and reforms within the framework of capitalism. Thus, the stand taken by the Socialist International and its leadership remains as contradictory as it was in the past. On the one hand, they criticise capitalism, exposing its inability to cope with essential problems; on the other hand, they try to eradicate social ills by means of—capitalism, with the help of state-monopoly regulation, and refuse to call upon the parties of the Socialist International and the working masses to fight for the radical restructuring of the entire capitalist system.

The contradictory nature of the Socialist International's stand manifested itself in the elaboration and adoption of a new programme.

The major changes in international life during the 1970s, the aggravation of the capitalist crisis and social and economic contradictions, the intensified class struggle, a certain shift to the left in the ideological and political principles of some socialist parties—all this called for the corresponding changes in the policy documents of the Socialist International. Since this was recognised by many social-democratic leaders, the question of replacing the old SI Programme with a new one was put on the agenda.

Nonetheless, as the 13th, 14th and 15th congresses showed, the leadership of the Socialist International, although aware of the need to replace the Frankfort Declaration with a new programme, did not hurry to do so. In fact, a special commission charged with the preparation of a new SI Declaration had been set up before the 13th Congress, and the draft declaration was to be considered by that congress. However, the question of the draft was not raised at the 13th Congress. The new Statutes adopted by the 13th Congress restated the allegiance of the Socialist International to its former programme.<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile, in February 1978, under pressure from a number of parties, a working group to prepare proposals for a new Declaration of Principles of the Socialist International was set up. The group was headed by Felipe González, General Secretary of the

<sup>1</sup> The 1976 Statutes of the Socialist International read: "The Socialist International is an association of parties which seek to establish democratic socialism as formulated in the Frankfurt Declaration of 1951" (quoted in: *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1977, p. 36).

Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, and included Karel van Miert, Chairman of the Belgian Socialist Party, Reiulf Steen, Chairman of the Norwegian Labour Party, and Bernt Carlsson, General Secretary of the Socialist International. Addressing the 14th Congress, Bernt Carlsson said in so many words: "The present Declaration of Principles of the Socialist International from 1951 with the revisions made in 1962 needs to be rewritten on many points in order to adapt it to the problems that we will be facing in the next decade."<sup>2</sup> However, this time, the new programme of the Socialist International was not discussed either.

The working group headed by González continued to work at its assignment. In 1979 it met twice to discuss the preparation of a new declaration. The results of the group's work as they were reported to the 15th SI Congress by González proved to be disappointing: the members of the group were not ready with their draft declaration and had not even come to an agreement on what kind of document the declaration was to be.

Speaking at the Congress Willy Brandt emphasised the necessity to continue elaborating the principles to govern the activity of the Socialist International and its parties: "In my opinion, we must make a fresh endeavour and attain clarity in our own minds as to what links us together across our different continents and cultural traditions by way of common values and convictions."<sup>2</sup> He also stressed that the principal ideas of the Frankfort Declaration were still valid.

Thus, in spite of considerable preparation and official promises that the new declaration would be discussed at the 13th and then 14th Congress, it was not even discussed at the 15th Congress. The International continues to base its activity on the programme adopted at the height of the cold war.

The main reason for this is that Western European and international social-democracy has failed to work out a common approach on a number of vital ideological and political issues. The differences on ideological problems displayed by individual social-democratic parties have been demonstrated by the Socialist International as a whole.

Some of the socialist parties are displaying a readiness to scout-

<sup>2</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1979, p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1, 1981, p. 7.

the some of the ideological dogmas introduced in the social-democratic movement during the cold war years. They are in favour of elaborating a better-defined anti-capitalist programme for solving social problems. Speaking at the 13th Congress of the Socialist International, François Mitterrand said: "The struggle for freedom will not succeed if we do not begin by abandoning and condemning all forms of exploitation of man by man and by ridding the world of economic oppression. Socialism must restore real meaning to these political rights and liberties. This must be done in both a practical and a theoretical way."<sup>1</sup> Nonetheless, the leaders of the social-democratic parties in the FRG, Austria, in the Scandinavian and some other countries show noticeable restraint in these matters and are in no hurry to renounce the positions recorded in the Frankfurt Declaration.

In addition to the differences in the positions taken by various Western European social-democratic parties, there is considerable disparity in the approach to modern capitalism, world problems and social-democratic goals taken by the social-democratic parties in Western Europe and those in non-European, above all, newly-free countries. The right-wingers fear, and justifiably so, that if a new programme is adopted they will have to reckon with the opinion of more radically-minded Western European and non-European members of the Socialist International. This will entail the incorporation of undesirable provisions in the new programme. The above considerations slow down and hamper work on a new policy document of the Socialist International.

The Socialist International, which constantly seeks to reconcile opposing tendencies and work out compromise positions, found itself in a predicament here. Its leaders realise the necessity of change in step with new realities. At the same time, they are afraid, and at times unwilling, to break with the past, with habitual, deep-rooted, traditional fundamentals. Their fear of a more radical programme is obvious.

The interests of the working class, of the multi-million working masses require that the Socialist International get rid of the lumber of the cold war times, reject the bankrupt concepts of capitalism's transformation into socialism and elaborate a truly socialist programme of struggle for the radical restructuring of the antagonistic society.

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1977, p. 21.

### Chapter Three

## THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

The Socialist International pays a great deal of attention to foreign policy and international relations. None of its congresses, conferences, Bureau sessions, meetings of the leaders or experts of social-democratic parties failed to discuss these problems.

The main reason for the Socialist International focusing on foreign policy and international relations is its desire to co-ordinate the activity of the social-democratic parties in the international arena, facilitate the formulation of a common policy on certain problems and eliminate differences emerging among them. The elaboration of a common stand is not an easy matter. This is due not only to the complicated and contradictory situation in the world but also to the different approaches taken by the parties of the Socialist International to various problems. This can also be accounted for by national specifics, different interests and the policy charted by the ruling classes in various countries.

An analysis of the Socialist International's foreign policy course shows that it has been and continues to be contradictory and inconsistent. On the one hand, the leaders of the International could not but take into account the bitter lessons of World War II, the enormous danger of a third world war and the desire of the peoples of the world for peace. Hence the slogans of peace and international security advanced by the Socialist International. On the other hand, the anti-Soviet, anti-communist orientation of social-democracy prompted the Socialist International and its parties to collaborate with US imperialism and the bourgeoisie in Western Europe and to back, at times, the actions that aggravated international tension and posed a threat to international peace and

security. The Socialist International's foreign policy has not been permanent and stable. On the contrary, it has been changing considerably under the impact of numerous factors and exhibiting different features in different periods of the International's history.

\* \* \*

In the early postwar years, the leaders of social-democratic parties justly believed that peace in Europe and throughout the world could be ensured only by maintaining friendly relations and co-operation with the Soviet Union. They thought highly of the Soviet Union's contribution to the victory over nazism and the liberation of the nazi-enslaved nations, and advocated maintaining the alliance with the USSR and stable co-operation among the countries of the anti-nazi coalition. Harold Laski, one of the leaders of Britain's Labour Party, stressed in a memorandum submitted to the first postwar socialist conference in Clacton (May 1946) that if co-operation between Russia and the Socialist International was established, Europe would become a socialist continent within twenty years. If co-operation with Russia failed, he went on to say, the greater part of Europe would become the booty of monopoly capitalism with the resultant threat of a third world war. In Laski's opinion, in order to avoid a catastrophe and, at the same time, to unite the working class throughout the world, the new International should seek friendship with the Soviet Union.<sup>1</sup> This point of view was reflected in the official statement of the Conference of the Socialist Parties. Drawing upon the experience of the Second World War, the Social-Democrats became convinced that the perpetrators of the crime of war were capitalism, the nazism and fascism engendered by capitalism and the ruling classes of the Western powers. Blinded by their class hatred of the Soviet Union, they pursued a policy of appeasing the nazi aggressors, thereby greatly promoting the preparations for, and the unleashing of, the war. The Declaration of the British Labour Party adopted in May 1945 pointed out: "We must consolidate in peace the great war-time association of the British Commonwealth with the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. Let it not be forgotten that in the years leading up to the war the Tories were so scared of Russia that they

<sup>1</sup> See: J. Braunthal, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-70.

missed the chance to establish a partnership which might well have prevented the war."<sup>1</sup>

In the early postwar years the social-democratic parties voiced their intention to pursue a policy independent of the ruling classes in the Western states, a policy designed to prevent the outbreak of a new world war. The idea of creating a "third force" to be operative on the world scene was especially popular with the Social-Democrats in those years. What was implied was a strong "socialist Europe", a force between the capitalist United States and the "communist Soviet Union", a force capable of mediating their differences and guaranteeing peace throughout the world. The cold war presented the Social-Democrats with a choice—either to support the Soviet Union or to side with the United States and other Western countries.

To say that the social-democratic parties set out to back US foreign policy without hesitation and internal controversy, readily renouncing the "third force" concept, would be sheer oversimplification. In fact, the situation provoked spirited debate and struggle both within and between individual parties, especially between the socialist parties of Western and Eastern Europe.

However, intimidated by talk about "Soviet aggression" and "communist dictatorship", the Western European Socialists chose to support the foreign policy pursued by the Western powers. This about-face was completed in April 1949, when the North Atlantic Treaty was prepared and signed.

The main principles underlying the foreign policy orientation of social-democracy in the cold war were discussed at the COMISCO Conference held in Copenhagen in June 1950. Morgan Phillips, COMISCO Chairman and Secretary of the British Labour Party, insisted in his speech at the Conference that the Socialists should not be neutral in the struggle against communism, and that it was their duty to support the Atlantic bloc. He lauded the United States and its policy and denounced those Social-Democrats who were critical of the US socio-economic system.

At the same time, having heaped slanderous accusations upon the Soviet Union and the communist parties, Phillips urged the Social-Democrats to reject the concept of a "third force" and to support the United States and other Western powers.

<sup>1</sup> *Yearbook*, 1956, p. 250.

Even before the Socialist International was restored, the leaders of Western European social-democracy had on the whole defined the essential principles of their foreign policy orientation in the new international situation ushered in by the cold war.

The task of the First Congress of the International was to lend more authority to the main foreign policy principles of Western European social-democracy, to provide them with more profound theoretical substantiation, to record them in policy documents, and to render them incumbent, to an extent, on all Socialist International parties and organisations.

Morgan Phillips, speaking at the First Congress in his capacity as the International's Chairman, again focused on defending US policy, and urged the social-democratic parties and governments to support it. The idea of the socialist parties' alliance with the US ruling circles and joint "defence efforts" of Western states was supported by other speakers. Hakon Lie, Secretary of the Norwegian Workers' Party, for instance, warned his colleagues in the International that the socialist parties would be committing a grave mistake if they came out in favour of cutting down military and political activity.

The Socialist International's overall position on foreign policy issues was formulated in its Programme, which recognised "the maintenance of world peace as the supreme task in our time".<sup>1</sup>

However, the International's Programme did not contain a single word in condemnation of the imperialist states' aggressive policy of forming various blocs, establishing military bases on the territory of other states, carrying on the arms race, i.e., a cold war policy fanning international tensions and threatening world peace.

Not only does the Programme of the Socialist International pass over in silence the fact that it is capitalism that breeds war and conflict, it even tries to acquit the major capitalist countries and portray them as victims of an aggressive policy pursued by other countries: "It is the threat to independence of free peoples [by free peoples the Frankfort Declaration implies the countries of the West—N.S.] which is directly responsible for the danger of war in our time."<sup>2</sup>

The leaders of European social-democracy supported the US rul-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45.

ers' appeals to the Western European countries to abandon their national policy and sovereignty in favour of a common "Atlantic policy". "Absolute national sovereignty must be transcended," they wrote in their declaration. The more concrete foreign policy tasks of the Socialist International's parties were formulated in a special resolution on "Socialist World Action in the Struggle for Peace". Although the resolution stated that peace was "one of the fundamental aims of international Socialism" and pledged the Socialist International "to work unremittingly in the cause of world peace", on the whole it was in favour of carrying on the arms race, setting up military bases and fanning a war hysteria. It claimed that it was the policy of the Soviet Union and the Cominform that "compelled free democratic countries to give a high priority to military defence", and recognised the need for the Western powers "to build up their strength in arms".<sup>2</sup>

While defending this course in the international arena, the Socialist International and its member parties pictured the struggle between the forces of socialism and capitalism in the world scene as confrontation between "totalitarian" and "democratic" countries. They considered it their task to support the "forces of democracy", i.e., the United States and other Western powers, in their struggle against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The Socialist International's foreign policy programme was met with approval by the bourgeois press in Europe and America. *The Economist* magazine, the organ of the British monopolies, for instance, noted with satisfaction that the resolution of the SI Congress on peace bound all the parties to support rearmament for the sake of collective defence against "communist aggression".

The Socialist International's line evoked alarm and protest on the part of those socialists who actually sought peace and realised the danger inherent in the Socialist International's policy. This became manifest as early as the Frankfort Congress. The delegate of the Japanese Socialist Party abstained from voting for the peace resolution, saying that socialism must oppose all military preparations in any circumstances.

The displeasure with the policy of the right-wing leadership was

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> *SH*, No. 39-41, 1952, p. 15.



expressed by members of many parties. For instance, Henry Pelling, a British Labourite, observed that "this policy of association with the United States and of rearmament . . . did not commend itself very warmly to the rank and file of the Labour Party".<sup>1</sup> However, in those days the discontent was not strong enough to make the Socialist International and its member parties give up the foreign policy they had formulated. In line with the resolutions of the First SI Congress, they encouraged, to no small extent, US and NATO policies. They regarded it as their essential task to ensure the working people's support for the war preparations and the militarisation of the economy pursued by the Western European governments. This matter was in the focus of the special session of the SI Council held in December 1951 in Brussels.

Conscious of the unpopularity of their policies among the masses, the leaders of the International contended that rearmament should be accompanied with a rise in the living standard of all nations and that its burden should be distributed evenly between the countries and the classes in each country.

Thus, instead of resolutely opposing militarisation and the arms race which threatened peace and imposed a heavy burden on the working people, the leaders of the International urged the workers in Western countries to support this policy and obediently shoulder their "share" of the burden. This position ran counter to the former principles of the international social-democratic movement. One may recall, for instance, that the resolution of the First Congress of the Labour and Socialist International held in 1923 in Hamburg stated: "The re-emergent Labour and Socialist International considers the struggle against capitalism leading up to war its ultimate goal. . . . The most important requirement of this struggle is the refusal of the workers' parties of all countries to render any support to the imperialist war and the refusal of the representatives of these parties in parliaments to approve military credits."<sup>2</sup>

The problems related to the revival of the army in West Germany attracted special attention in the Socialist International. Here, as in many other foreign policy areas, the leaders of European

<sup>1</sup> Henry Pelling, *A Short History of the Labour Party*, Macmillan & Co. Ltd., London, 1961, p. 99.

<sup>2</sup> *Protokoll des Internationalen Sozialistischen Arbeiterkongress in Hamburg, 21 bis 23 Mai, Berlin, 1923*, p. 101.

social-democracy abandoned their positions of the early postwar years. At the end of the war and immediately after it all Social-Democrats agreed that it was imperative to liquidate the army of the German imperialists and not to allow it to emerge again in the future. This is easy to understand: the Social-Democrats could not but take into account that it was German militarism that initiated the two world wars which caused incalculable losses and suffering in Europe and throughout the world. The German militarists assisted the nazis in strangling the workers' and democratic movements everywhere in Europe. It was for this reason that the March 1945 Socialist Conference adopted a special resolution demanding the complete disarmament of Germany and prohibiting it from having ground, naval and air forces in the future.

However, as the cold war intensified and the social-democratic parties' support for US policy grew, the socialist leaders retreated further and further from their former positions. The question of reviving the army of the German militarists had been discussed in great detail at the 1950 and 1951 COMISCO sessions and brought about heated debate in the organs of the Socialist International.

After a period of hesitation and doubt the overwhelming majority of social-democratic parties agreed that West Germany should have a strong army. The main argument in favour of this decision was that without a "German contribution", as Morgan Phillips put it, it would be impossible to defend the "Elbe line" because the United States would send its divisions to defend this line only if the Germans provided theirs.

But while the Western European social-democratic leaders were unanimous in their support for the revival of an army in West Germany, they differed on how and under what conditions this was to be done.

The representatives of Holland, Belgium and France believed that a West German army should be revived within the framework of a "European army". The leaders of the British Labourites were of a different opinion. They realised that a "European army" would not only revive the army of the West German militarists but would also put the British army under the control of the US and West German militarists. They were not prepared to accept this, seeking to play an as independent as possible, if not the leading, role in Western Europe. Nor were the Scandi-



navian Social-Democrats enthusiastic about the idea of mustering a "European army".

The leaders of the SPD of Germany took a stand of their own. They held that they would not oppose the formation of a "European army" provided the West German army as well as the West German state enjoyed the same rights and status as the other members of the alliance.

The question was repeatedly discussed in 1952 and 1953, only to become a pivotal issue of the Brussels Conference of the Western European Socialists which took place on February 27-28, 1954.

The majority of the delegates of the parties in Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, Italy, Norway and Austria voted in favour of the resolution supporting the European Defence Community and the project to create a West German army.<sup>1</sup>

This touched off infighting in social-democratic parties. Many Socialists objected to reviving German militarism. Even the party leadership was divided on the issue. For instance, the 1954 Conference of the British Labour Party adopted a resolution on remilitarising Germany by a majority of only 250,000 votes out of a total of 6,000,000.<sup>2</sup> In the Labour group in Parliament, the right-wingers succeeded in pushing their resolution through by only 113 votes against 104.

Despite all their efforts, the advocates of a "European army" failed to carry out their project as the French Parliament refused to ratify the treaty on creating a European Defence Community. This caused confusion in the reactionaries' camp. Under pressure from the US ruling quarters, the Paris Agreements were urgently prepared and signed in October 1954. The Agreements boiled down to rebuilding a West German army within NATO rather than within the framework of a "European army".

The main point on the agenda of the Amsterdam session of the Socialist International held on December 20-21, 1954, on the eve of the ratification of the Paris Agreements, was the rearmament of West Germany. The majority of the International's members advocated the policy pursued by the NATO member

countries. The SPD of Germany was the only party to speak out against the Paris Agreements on the revival of the West German army. Erich Ollenhauer, the party's leader, justifying the SPD position, argued that the actions taken by the Western powers would hamper the negotiations on German reunification.

Nonetheless, the Amsterdam Conference of the Socialist International, acting contrary to the interests of the European nations and the insistence of the SPD of Germany's leaders, supported the Paris Agreements, and thereby rendered important assistance to the leadership of the NATO countries in implementing the policy of West German remilitarisation. The anti-Soviet and anti-communist stand taken by the leaders of the European social-democracy thus brought them to back policies and actions which a short while before would have been regarded by them as inconceivable and inadmissible.

The area of the Socialist International's interests included European integration and a project for creating a "united Europe".

As is well known, during the cold war the objective process of the internationalisation of production and the social division of labour in Western European countries was taken advantage of by the ruling classes of capitalist countries in order to supplement the military alliance of Western powers with an economic association of Western European countries and to employ this association in the struggle against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. The leadership of Western countries needed European integration as a means of pooling efforts in the struggle against the revolutionary working-class and national liberation movements.

Nevertheless, as the time for the practical implementation of the projects to "unite Europe" drew closer, individual socialist parties became more and more divided on the issue. This division manifested itself, in particular, at the October 1950 COMISCO session held to discuss European integration problems. The participants in the session failed to come to an agreement. It was decided to set up a study group on European unity and to appoint the Belgian Socialist Victor Larock its Chairman. The report prepared by the study group underlay the resolution on the unity of Europe adopted by the First Congress of the Socialist International. Supporting the plans for European integration, the International declared: "...No nation can solve all its economic and social problems in isolation, ... absolute national sov-

<sup>1</sup> See: *SH*, No. 11-12, p. 183.

<sup>2</sup> See: Henry Pelling, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

ereignty must be transcended ... Such a strengthening of the unity of Europe will serve the interests of the whole world."<sup>1</sup>

The concrete historical setting in which the leaders of the Socialist International came out in favour of the project for European integration rendered the above thesis groundless. It goes without saying that political, economic and social development makes it imperative for various countries to co-operate, develop trade relations and exchange scientific and technical knowledge. However, it would be absolutely wrong to argue that economic and social problems in certain countries remain unsolved because these countries retain their self-sufficiency and independence and that national borders and state sovereignty impede social progress. The reason for many social problems in capitalist countries going unsolved is the supremacy of private ownership, capitalist production relations and the exploitation of man by man. This aspect of the matter was intentionally neglected by the Socialist International leaders when they portrayed the proposed elimination of the state sovereignty of individual Western European countries as the main means of solving economic and social problems.

Equally untenable was the argument of the European social-democratic leaders that the creation of a "united Europe" would allegedly serve the cause of peace. There is no denying that the interests of peace require that the countries of Europe and the whole world draw closer together, their relations improve and all outstanding issues be settled peacefully. However, the efforts of the US and other Western imperialists were aimed at uniting only Western Europe and not the whole of Europe. And this could only eventually split Europe, and establish in Western Europe a closed group of capitalist countries opposed to Eastern Europe, i.e., to the socialist countries. This meant that the leaders of the Socialist International, while advocating peace in word, in deed helped the reactionary forces to set up a European alliance as a supplement to the aggressive Atlantic bloc and yet another tool for pursuing the policy of international imperialism.

Despite the fact that all the parties of the International were agreed on the necessity to create a "united Europe", they failed to reach agreement on the ways of translating their idea into life. Moreover, some parties, particularly the British Labour Party, in

fact opposed the incorporation of their countries in a European federation and objected to renouncing the principles of national sovereignty.

This position was shared at the time by the leaders of the Socialist Democratic Party of Germany. C. Schmid described their position as follows: "The German Social-Democrats believe it is an illusion to regard the 'Little Europe' either as a growing point for a united Europe or as a fruitful soil for Socialist advance ... But the union of the six States may only lead to new conflicts; instead of the national egotisms of the separate six States we may see a new egotism of the larger State."<sup>2</sup> Schmid went on to say that this union would be headed by such people as de Gasperi and Adenauer "who do not talk about class policies but who do in fact pursue them". He agreed that his friends, the Socialists of Belgium, Holland and other countries of the "Little Europe", were reaching for other goals. "But the balance of political forces in this Union is such," he remarked, "as to make their chances of success look extremely small."<sup>3</sup> This German Social-Democrat, one will agree, had a good understanding of the nature and essence of the Western policy aimed at creating a "united Europe".

All these differences notwithstanding, the leaders of the Socialist International were unanimous in supporting the basic guidelines in the foreign and military policy of the Western powers. In the resolution on a European union adopted by the Second Congress they declared that it was "necessary for all the free nations to strengthen their defences ... [and] to regulate their armament programme on an international basis by common agreement."<sup>3</sup>

The resolute anti-communist position of the Second Congress, which voted for rearmament, European unity and other actions designed to erect a barrier to the further spread of communism, was acclaimed by the European and American bourgeoisie.

The Socialist International rendered the ruling circles in Western countries no small assistance in launching slanderous campaigns and subversion against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. Since the early days of the triumphant proletarian

<sup>1</sup> *SH*, No. 39-41, 1952, pp. 17-18.

<sup>2</sup> *SH*, No. 47, 1952, p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> *SH*, No. 43-44, 1952, p. 13.

revolutions in the countries of Central and Southeast Europe the leaders of the International have aligned themselves with the reactionaries in an effort to hamper the development of these countries along socialist lines. At various SI congresses and conferences they adopted or endorsed resolutions which were tabled by right-wing socialist emigrés from the people's democracies, demanding that these countries be "liberated".

This sentiment of the leaders of the Socialist International clearly manifested itself during the events of 1956 in Hungary. As soon as the revolt started, the Socialist International joined the campaign to support the anti-communist elements and assail the Soviet Union and communist parties. On November 1, 1956, an urgent meeting of the SI Bureau was convened. Unlike its usual sessions normally held in London, the Bureau gathered in Vienna, as close to Hungary as possible. The Bureau adopted a statement expressing gratitude to the Hungarian "rebels" and admiration for their actions. The Bureau appealed to the SI parties to support the "freedom fighters" with all means at their disposal. The "Hungarian issue" was discussed by the conference of the SI Council held in late November and early December 1956 in Copenhagen. The Conference adopted a resolution in which the International "solemnly protested" against the Soviet Union's actions and demanded "the right to form free and democratic parties in all the countries of Eastern Europe".<sup>1</sup>

In early 1957, the Socialist International set up the Anna Kethly Fund to assist the anti-communist activity of right-wing Socialists. The Socialist International financed subversive activity in Hungary and provided those engaged in it with the requisite literature. The position of the Socialist International leadership on the Hungarian developments did not differ substantially from that taken by the most reactionary forces in the capitalist world. It is not by accident that Aising Andersen, Chairman of the Socialist International, was appointed head of a special UN commission to "investigate" the events in Hungary.

The pro-imperialist character of the policy shaped by the leaders of the International was vividly manifest in their stand on the British-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt in 1956.

Thus, in the early cold war years the leaders of the Socialist In-

ternational, affected by anti-communist sentiment and intimidated by the supposed danger of "Soviet aggression", vigorously assisted the ruling classes in the United States and Western Europe in carrying out their imperialist plans. They backed the Western powers' policy towards intensifying the arms race, creating military blocs, militarising West Germany, "integrating" Europe, and taking actions against socialist countries and the liberation movement in colonial and dependent countries.

\* \* \*

The second half of the 1950s witnessed substantial shifts in the alignment of forces in the international arena and in the struggle for universal peace and an end to the arms race.

The Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole made a decisive contribution to the struggle against the aggressive plans hatched by the US and its NATO allies.

The peace-loving foreign policy pursued by the USSR, the consolidation of the forces of peace and socialism, the growth of the working-class and national liberation movements—all this undermined the imperialist positions and created prerequisites for international détente and a lasting peace. The resolutions of the 20th CPSU Congress scientifically substantiated the conclusion on the possibility of averting a new world war. They called on all peace champions to join efforts in working towards this noble goal.

The developments of those days showed that the attempts of the reactionary capitalist forces to change the situation in Europe, particularly in the Hungarian People's Republic and the Middle East, in their favour suffered a setback. The power politics proved to be incapable of solving the tasks the ruling classes in Western countries set themselves. The imperialists could no longer do what they wished with impunity. The year 1956 provided convincing evidence that the danger of a new world war was not a myth, but a reality, created not by the alleged threat of "Soviet aggression" but by the policy of international imperialism. The danger of a world thermonuclear war cast a new light on the world situation and compelled many people to look for new approaches to outstanding global problems.

All this strongly affected the leaders of the Socialist International who were unable to ignore the threat of a new world war and

<sup>1</sup>SI, No. 49, 1956, pp. 347-48.

the growing movement for peace and disarmament. The Fifth SI Congress, held from July 2 to 6, 1957 in Vienna, revealed new tendencies and certain positive shifts in the positions of the International. The usual statements in support of the policy of the Western powers were accompanied by a number of proposals which could have played a positive role in the efforts to ease international tensions and foster mutual understanding among nations.

Among the vital problems discussed by the Congress was the averting of the danger of nuclear war, collective security in Europe and the reunification of Germany. The two main reports on the international situation, delivered by Hugh Gaitskell and Erich Ollenhauer, focused on these problems. It is noteworthy that the reports were not as blatantly anti-Soviet and anti-communist as many of the pronouncements of the Socialist International leaders at previous congresses. The reports stressed the importance of disarmament negotiations between the great powers. The Congress came out in favour of banning the nuclear weapon tests, thereby supporting the initiative advanced by the Soviet Union. The resolution on disarmament stated that the arms race and the rivalry in producing atomic weaponry of tremendous destructive force posed a great threat to mankind.

Late 1957 witnessed an outstanding achievement of Soviet science and technology, the launching of the world's first artificial Earth satellite. The Soviet breakthrough made a tremendous impression on the peoples of the world, the top officials of capitalist countries and the social-democratic leaders. It exposed as groundless the calculations of the US and NATO strategists based on their belief in the scientific, technical and military superiority of the West and the unsurpassable level of US technology.

Troubled by this turn of affairs, the Western leaders rushed to convene a session of the NATO Council. The US suggested bolstering its military-strategic positions in Europe by deploying American missiles on the territory of its allies. But this proposal was not received as enthusiastically as overseas politicians had expected. The countries whose governments were headed by Social-Democrats (Belgium, Denmark and Norway) refused to let the US deploy its nuclear missiles on their territories.

The foregoing compelled the leaders of the Socialist International to give serious thought to the essential problems of war and peace. Alsing Andersen, Chairman of the International, addressing

the Danish Parliament, said: "Not only in Denmark but throughout the world the people are looking at recent developments in the techniques of war with deep anxiety. This development should have convinced all leading statesmen that war can no longer be a means of pursuing political aims."<sup>1</sup>

Victor Larock, the Belgian Foreign Minister at the time, observed: "Modern weapons have such destructive force that our arguments on war and peace can no longer be the same as before."<sup>2</sup>

Britain's Labour Party issued a memorandum entitled "Recent Russian Technical Development—Military and Political Implications", a document intended for the leadership of the Socialist International. The memorandum admitted the failure of the Western powers' former strategy and emphasised the need for elaborating a new one.

The memorandum "Security Through Disarmament" issued by the Social-Democratic Party of Germany also dealt with shaping a new foreign policy course for the Socialist International. So long as the view prevails that military measures alone can ensure the security of nations, stressed the memorandum, obstacles to reducing the threat of war and settling disputes by peaceful means will continue to exist. For this reason, the task of democratic Socialists, the memorandum went on to say, is to persuade their peoples and governments to give heed to current developments and to realise that the existing situation calls not for intensifying the arms race but for efforts to achieve disarmament under international control; that agreements between states could be reached only by means of negotiation; that the nuclear powers must not hand over nuclear arms to other countries; that the existing systems of military alliances should be used in resolving political problems, and that the struggle for disarmament should be broadened both through the services of the United Nations and through bilateral talks.

The section of the memorandum cited above testified to the SPD leaders' concern over the situation and to their desire to find a way out of it through disarmament and peaceful settlement of disputes. The key points of the memorandum could provide a sound foundation for co-operation between the Socialists

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 6, 1958, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 5, 1958, p. 65.

and Communists in the struggle for peace and disarmament, for implementing the principles of peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems.

The spirit of the memorandum essentially differed from that of the SPD's former statements. This was of course due to the fact that the document was designed not as a piece of propaganda addressed to the social-democratic rank and file but as the groundwork for a new political course of the Socialist International. The memorandum's content and tone were also determined by the fact that the socialist leaders themselves no longer believed in the propaganda-oriented accusations levelled at the Soviet Union.

The positive shifts in the positions of individual parties, above all those of Britain's Labour Party and the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, were recorded in a number of documents. The latter include the SPD's "Social-Democratic Plan for Germany" published on March 19, 1959. Although the plan displayed certain inconsistency and contained a number of reservations and erroneous theses, it still was an important step forward in the search for an acceptable programme of strengthening European security and resolving the German problem.<sup>1</sup>

*Pravda*, commenting on the importance of the SPD's plan, wrote: "The fact that a major West German party has proposed a plan for settling the German problem and strengthening European security, is, despite all the plan's shortcomings, of considerable international importance, since the Social-Democratic Party of Germany is advancing a number of points which could become a subject of businesslike discussion among the countries concerned."<sup>2</sup>

A more realistic approach of the Social-Democrats to international relations also manifested itself in the deliberations and resolutions of the Sixth Congress of the Socialist International held on July 14-17, 1959 in Hamburg. Addressing the Congress, Hugh Gaitskell said that democratic socialism could not be built on the ruins of humanity. Therefore, safeguarding peace was the ultimate goal. Although the position set forth in the speech lacked consistency, it embraced a number of principles which could be conducive to easing international tensions and checking the arms race.

<sup>1</sup> See: *SII*, No. 15, 1959, p. 211.

<sup>2</sup> *Pravda*, April 5, 1959.

The Congress resolutions reflected certain attempts to find ways towards reaching understanding with the Soviet Union. The Congress supported the ideas of convening a meeting of the heads of government of four powers, ending the cold war, banning nuclear weapon tests, initiating universal disarmament, disengaging the military forces and creating a nuclear-free zone in Europe, and other demands which, on the whole, met the interests of peace and detente.<sup>1</sup> The positive shifts in the positions of social-democracy could have provided a starting point for charting a new foreign policy programme for the Socialist International and laid the groundwork for co-operation between the Socialists and the Communists in the struggle for peace.

Unfortunately, this did not take place in those years. The way towards such a development was blocked by, among others, the more anti-Soviet members of the Socialist International who did not want to discard outdated perceptions and patterns and join the search for new ways to a lasting world peace. The greatest intransigence towards the proposals from the SPD and the British Labour Party was exhibited by the leaders of the Dutch Labour Party (DLT) and the French Socialist Party. A week after the SPD memorandum "Security Through Disarmament" had been circulated, the Dutch Labour Party made its objections to the European collective security project known to the other parties in the International. The DLT claimed that implementing the SPD proposals would eventually undermine Western security, and that establishing a collective security system in Europe would create a no man's zone in Europe and enhance the threat of "Soviet aggression". The establishment of a collective security system, the DLT leaders claimed, would cancel out NATO and leave Western Europe unarmed before the Soviet Union.<sup>2</sup>

The right-wing forces in the Socialist International backed the idea of founding a Common Market on the basis of the Rome Accords. They expected it to be not merely an organisation for economic co-operation among Western European countries, but a means of uniting them for struggle against the "Soviet threat".

The pressure brought to bear by the advocates of building up

<sup>1</sup> See: *SII*, No. 36, 1959, pp. 439-41.

<sup>2</sup> *The Socialist International. Objections to the Project for European Collective Security*, December 12, 1957.

NATO's military potential caused the Sixth SI Congress to denounce the French authorities for withdrawing the greater part of France's military forces from under the control of the Atlantic bloc's bodies.

Some of the International's top members sought to justify theoretically the necessity for the socialist parties to support the military policy pursued by the capitalist states. In his speech at the Sixth Congress, Oscar Pollak contended that the changes in the attitude of the working class in Western countries to the state and to its own "integration" with the state and the nation affected its attitude to the "national defence" policy. In the past, said Pollak, the working class opposed the policy of "national defence" since it was pursued by a state hostile to the workers. Now, Pollak contended, the working class supported the "national defence" policy since it was pursued by a state which sought to meet the interests of the workers and the entire people.

Pollak's ideas mirrored the International's prevailing point of view. Supporting it, Jules Moch once remarked that Jean Jaurès's famous observation "Capitalism carries within it war, as the cloud a storm" was no longer valid.<sup>1</sup>

The advancement of fresh arguments to substantiate the socialist parties' support for the military and foreign policies of bourgeois states can be explained, among other things, by the fact that social-democratic ideologists misinterpreted the nature of the new tendencies exhibited in the actions of Western powers. They regarded the declarations made by the leaders of certain capitalist countries on the need for peace and peaceful coexistence and their willingness to engage in negotiations and peaceful settlement of certain international problems—due to the fact that in the existing circumstances it was no longer possible to resolve global issues by force—as evidence of change in the nature of the bourgeois state, of its newly-attained freedom from its inborn imperialist and aggressive tendencies.

It should be pointed out that the resolutions of the Sixth Congress of the Socialist International had a negative effect on the policy of its member parties. In a number of cases, they affected the attitude of these parties to the policy of bourgeois governments. This is exemplified by the dramatic change in the

positions taken by the Social-Democratic Party of Germany. At their May 1958 Conference held in Stuttgart, the West German Social-Democrats declared that as long as Adenauer's government existed and the cold war policy was carried on, they would not recognise the need for "national defence". The resolution of the conference stated: "Only when the present foreign and defence policy is replaced by one directed towards relaxation of tension and reunification in guaranteed freedom can a sensible national defence system be created in the German Federal Republic."<sup>2</sup> The conference resolution also denounced the introduction of universal compulsory military service and the nuclear armament of West Germany.

However, the new SPD programme adopted in Bad Godesberg in November 1959 showed that the right-wing leaders had saddled the party with a new policy, a policy supporting Adenauer's government and "national defence".<sup>3</sup> In November 1960, at their Hannover Congress, they went even further. The resolutions of the Hannover Congress emphasised the necessity for West German parties to have a "common foreign policy". They proclaimed "the defence of the free democratic foundations of the state" "an obligation on every citizen" and insisted on the FRG contributing to the implementation of NATO policy. While declaring that the activity of the Federal Republic of Germany should not be aimed at increasing the number of nuclear powers, the Congress nonetheless insisted that "the German armed forces must be provided with effective equipment and armaments."<sup>4</sup> This meant that on all the key issues of the foreign and defence policies the SPD leadership capitulated to the NATO bosses.

It stands to reason that these changes in the SPD's positions had an adverse effect on other social-democratic parties and the Socialist International by hampering the elaboration of a new realistic course of social-democracy on the world scene.

Thus, an analysis of the policy pursued by the Socialist International and its parties in the latter half of the 1950s will show that under the influence of profound changes in the international arena, the successes scored by the Soviet Union and other

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 1-2, 1960, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 23, 1958, p. 352.

<sup>3</sup> See: *SI*, No. 48, 1959, p. 738.

<sup>4</sup> *SI*, No. 49, 1960, p. 723.



socialist countries and their active work towards peace, and under the pressure of millions of workers and rank-and-file Socialists, the Socialist International's positions underwent positive transformation. The International started to speak out on the necessity to strengthen peace and conduct negotiations on disarmament and ban the production, testing and use of nuclear weapons.

However, these changes were very contradictory and met with serious opposition on the part of the extreme right, who doggedly defended the principles underlying the earlier course pursued by the Social-Democrats in the world arena. As a result, despite certain realistic tendencies which started to appear in the policy of the International, the social-democratic parties generally remained loyal to the US and NATO policies and facilitated imperialist actions against the socialist countries and liberation forces in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The 1960s saw the beginning of the third stage in the general crisis of capitalism. In the international arena at this time the positions of imperialism weakened further, imperialism's colonial system collapsed and many new Asian and African states emerged.

In these years international relations were developing amidst a complicated and contradictory situation. The arms race went on, military expenditures continued to grow, wars were raging in Indochina, in the Middle East and other areas, and international tensions persisted. At the same time, the imperialist quarters were compelled to recognise that the positions-of-strength policy vis-à-vis the socialist community had failed. The leaders of capitalist states agreed to engage in negotiations with the Soviet Union. As a result, important agreements were reached on banning nuclear weapons testing (1963) and on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons (1968). Western powers started to reconsider their foreign policy concepts, adjusting them to the new conditions of the struggle between the two systems in the world arena.

The changes occurring in the world and in the policy of the Western countries had a great impact on the social-democratic parties of the Socialist International. Various tendencies became more pronounced in their foreign policy concepts and positions. The efforts of the International's leaders to stick to the former course of supporting anti-Soviet policies pursued by Western powers were coupled with a search for new ways and means of

tackling global problems. The search went on sporadically, marked by infighting within the Socialist International. Any aggravation of international tensions and complications in East-West relations seriously impeded positive shifts in social-democracy and sometimes revived cold war attitudes among the Social-Democrats.

This was evidenced by the Seventh SI Congress held in October 1961. It was convened in the midst of a new anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaign launched by the imperialist forces in connection with the Cuban missile crisis and the measures taken by the German Democratic Republic to strengthen the border separating it from West Berlin.

Many of the International's leaders were not only affected by this campaign but encouraged attacks on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in their speeches at the Congress. They declared that in the existing circumstances it was the Socialist International's and its parties' duty to foster the cohesion of Western countries, to promote European integration and NATO's consolidation. The intensified anti-communist campaign left an imprint on the draft of the new declaration of the International which was submitted for the approval of the Seventh SI Congress. In November 1961, *Tribune*, the organ of the British left-wing Labourites, wrote that the representatives of the socialist parties in the developing countries who attended the Congress "had a knock when they read the draft Statement. It was anti-Communist, pro-West, and pro-NATO".<sup>1</sup>

This concerned, first of all, the erroneous assessment of the foreign policy of the Western powers, on the one hand, and the policy pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, on the other. The actions taken by the NATO member countries were viewed merely as "forced measures of self-defence" allegedly directed towards safeguarding peace. At the same time, the peaceful actions of the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy were pictured as a "threat" to peace and blamed for creating international tensions.

Refusing to recognise the objective existence of the two social systems, socialism and capitalism, the social-democratic ideologists saw the causes of the world's division into two camps, or, as

<sup>1</sup> *Tribune*, November 3, 1961, p. 7.



they chose to put it, into the communist and non-communist worlds, to lie not in the objective laws of social development but in the ill will of the Communists.

The incorrect, anti-scientific perception of the causes of the world's split into West and East and of struggle between them explains the SI leaders' misunderstanding of the policy of peaceful coexistence of states belonging to the two systems. First of all, the principled positions of the Communists on the class struggle in the international arena, on peaceful economic competition between the two systems, their statements on the inevitable collapse of capitalism and the victory of communism were pictured by the Socialist International as the renunciation of the very principle of peaceful coexistence, as the refusal of socialist countries to pursue a peaceful foreign policy. Secondly, what the Communists said regarding the inevitability of ideological struggle in the international arena was perceived by social-democracy as something running counter to the very idea of coexistence. In order to ensure genuine coexistence, the Social-Democrats maintained, any struggle, ideological struggle included, had to be rejected. This attitude was embodied in the "coexistence plus" concept, i.e., physical coexistence plus ideological coexistence.

The Western European Social-Democrats expressed their "firm determination to uphold" the Atlantic bloc, which, they claimed, had turned into "a powerful bulwark of peace"<sup>1</sup> in recent years.

The efforts of West European social-democratic leaders to impose their policy on the socialist parties in Asia and Africa suffered a setback. The Socialists in non-European countries rejected the draft declaration prepared by the Socialist International's leaders. The outcome of the Rome Congress provided fresh evidence of the bankruptcy of the International's foreign policy and the necessity to work out a new one.

The International's leaders could not but take into account the stand of the socialist parties in the developing countries whose support they sought. They had to take into account the European parties' criticism of the International, including the critical pronouncements of some of the International's most prominent figures.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 24-25, 1962, p. 360.

<sup>2</sup> At the Seventh Congress of the International Hugh Gaitskell,

This explains the reasons for including some new theses in the International's declaration adopted in Oslo in 1962. The declaration mentions, among other things, the International's respect for the desire of the developing countries to pursue any policy they deem necessary, without entering Western blocs, and opposes the efforts to draw these countries into the Western alliance against their will. The incorporation of a statement to this effect in the declaration is undoubtedly a concession to the Socialists in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It will be recalled that for a number of years the Socialist International had resolutely opposed this kind of neutrality since, in the struggle between "democratic" and "totalitarian" states it would allegedly mean "assisting communism" and "betraying the cause of peace and democracy".

Noteworthy is another thesis which was incorporated in the new declaration. To explain the reasons behind international tensions, the declaration stated that the tension in Asia was caused, among other things, by "certain aspects of US policy". This was the first occasion in the history of the Socialist International when its policy-making document contained a critical remark on US policy.

It is also significant that the declaration voiced the International's desire for "an end to the cold war" and its disagreement with the thesis that the division of the world into opposing blocs is perpetual. It was another concession to the adherents of the policy of non-participation in blocs as well as to those forces in the Socialist International which were more consistent in supporting peace and detente. Moreover, the new declaration contained a demand to initiate universal disarmament, ban the production and use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, put an end to the cold war and solve all disputes by peaceful means.

Thus, an analysis of the Socialist International's programmatic declaration of 1962 will prove its positions on foreign policy problems to be very contradictory. The declaration includes statements on the need for peace, disarmament, and international detente which mirror the striving of the peoples of the world for peace

Paul-Henri Spaak and some other speakers proposed reconsidering some of the Socialist International's positions. Gaitskell, for instance, suggested recognising the Oder-Neisse line as the final frontier, recognising the German Democratic Republic, and setting up a disarmament zone in Central Europe (*SI*, No. 16-17, 1962, pp. 236, 237).

and could have played a positive role in the struggle against the danger of a new world war. But, at the same time, this declaration, just as the one before it, states that a "threat to peace" was posed by the policy of the Soviet Union and the communist parties, that NATO is the "bulwark of peace" and it is the duty of the Socialists to support "Western democracies". By making such statements, the leaders of the Socialist International confused the masses and maintained mistrust and hostility towards the Soviet Union and the communist parties.

The Eighth SI Congress, held on September 8-12, 1963 in Amsterdam, revealed the contradictory nature of the Socialist International's positions and the existence of opposing opinions and trends within its ranks. In his report on the international situation, Harold Wilson noted that "moving into more open country" would require "imagination and courage". While welcoming the appearance of positive shifts and the signing of the Moscow Test-Ban Treaty, he emphasised that among the problems yet to be approached priority should be given to ensuring disarmament, reaching an agreement on the non-proliferation of atomic weapons and establishing a zone of controlled disarmament in Central Europe.

The need for new approaches to international relations was also stressed at the Tenth SI Congress held in May 1966 in Stockholm.

Admittedly, some of the delegates approved of the policy which European social-democracy had pursued in the international arena. The representatives of the SPD supported the US and NATO policies and the US-European alliance, and proposed that "a few specially-interested Social-Democratic parties should form a working committee" to elaborate constructive proposals for "overcoming the NATO crisis".<sup>1</sup> On the whole, however, the Tenth Congress was indicative of positive changes in the social-democratic approach to foreign policy issues. Unlike the previous ones, the Tenth Congress hardly heard any slighting remarks about the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. On the contrary, all the speakers stressed the need for expanding East-West contacts and talks. The results of the Tenth Congress showed that in the mid-1960s the situation which had gradually taken shape

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 16-17, 1966, pp. 175-76.

within the Socialist International favoured the adoption of a new approach to international problems. Of special importance was the search for new ways of ensuring European security. The Social-Democrats came to give more heed to the socialist countries' proposals on establishing a European collective security system.

In October 1966, the Socialist International's Chairman Bruno Pitterman advanced important proposals on measures to promote peace in Europe, including:

- reaching an agreement on disarmament and the non-proliferation of atomic weapons in European countries;
- banning the use of atomic weapons in Europe;
- ensuring a gradual withdrawal of foreign troops from other nations' territories, including the withdrawal of US troops from European countries;
- developing economic and other types of co-operation among all European countries;
- concluding a European non-aggression pact.<sup>1</sup>

In the mid-1960s many Social-Democrats began to insist that the FRG government recognise the existing frontiers along the Oder and Neisse, recognise the German Democratic Republic and repudiate atomic weapons. In late 1966, Paul-Henri Spaak wrote: "If the West Germans want the support of public opinion in the Western countries they must have the courage to adopt clear attitudes on two issues: that of frontiers and that of nuclear weapons."<sup>2</sup>

The French Socialist Party was even more specific in formulating these demands. In its foreign policy statement it declared:

"1. We agree with the U.S.S.R. and the other Eastern countries that the Federal Republic of Germany should not be allowed to control nuclear weapons.

"2. We agree with Poland that Germany should guarantee the inviolability of the Oder-Neisse frontier.

"3. We agree with Czechoslovakia that Hitler's Munich "dictat" of 1939 should be annulled. . .

"5. A government of the Left will certainly not fail to re-examine and re-consider the Rapacki Plan for the denuclearisation of Central Europe, given favourable circumstances."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See: *SI*, No. 4, 1967, pp. 43-45.

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 14-15, 1966, p. 163.

<sup>3</sup> *SI*, No. 5, 1967, p. 58.

These demands could not but influence the positions of the leaders of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. The issues under consideration became particularly significant for the SPD because in December 1966 its leaders, for the first time since the Second World War, gained seats in the FRG government, with Willy Brandt becoming Vice-Chancellor and Foreign Minister.

The SPD leaders became increasingly aware of the bankruptcy and hopelessness of the former policy and the necessity to define new foreign policy guidelines. In this connection, Helmut Schmidt observed: "The German policies of past years have to a great extent limited our ability to act in foreign affairs. The leaders started from the assumption that the main aim of German policies, the re-establishment of German unity, could be reached by pressure from the most powerful Western allies." Having concluded that "this concept of policy from a position of strength had failed ultimately a long time ago", Schmidt stressed that "it was vital to establish better relations" with the Soviet Union and the East European countries.<sup>1</sup>

The year 1968 saw a considerable shift in the SPD's positions. Addressing the SPD Nuremberg Congress held in March 1968, Brandt declared that it was unrealistic in the existing circumstances to raise the question of the unification of the German nation and that it was necessary to recognise and respect the Oder-Neisse line.<sup>2</sup> Subsequently, Willy Brandt repeatedly stressed that the FRG was especially interested in establishing a peaceful climate in Europe since the Germans were bound to be involved in possible military conflicts, and would be the first ones whose existence as a nation would be at stake. Speaking at the Geneva conference of non-nuclear states in September 1968, Willy Brandt declared that the Federal Republic of Germany renounced the production and possession of atomic weapons.

The foundation of the SPD's new *Ostpolitik*, a policy based on European realities and the necessity to preserve peace and international security, was thus gradually laid. The positive shifts in the SPD's positions were of great importance for the Socialist International, since German social-democracy started to play an increasingly significant role among the European Social-Democrats after its leaders had gained seats in the government.

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 1-2, 1967, p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 7, 1968, p. 67.

Another important feature of the activity of the Socialist International and its parties in the mid-1960s was their more critical attitude to US policy. While in the past the Socialist International's leaders acquiesced to the overt violence and aggression of the American imperialists, now, when there appeared a growing tendency towards the relaxation of international tensions, they could not close their eyes to such actions on the part of the United States and were frequently compelled to criticise its policy.

For the first time since the foundation of the Socialist International, its leaders officially expressed their disapproval of the US actions in connection with the 1965 intervention in the Dominican Republic.

Of still greater importance for the activity of the Socialist International and its attitude to US policy was the social-democratic campaign of protest against the American aggression in Vietnam. Especially active in condemning the US aggression were the parties in Scandinavian countries (particularly Sweden and Finland), in Canada, and the Japanese Socialist Party. The campaign reached its height in the first few months of 1965, after the US imperialists had bombed the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The socialist parties in a number of countries demanded that the war be ended immediately, US troops withdrawn from Vietnam and other Indochinese countries, and the peoples of these countries granted the right to determine their future without outside interference, in compliance with the Geneva agreements of 1954.

These issues were given careful consideration at the Tenth Congress of the Socialist International. In its resolution the Congress called for "an immediate cessation of bombing and other hostilities", for a peace conference to be attended by all parties involved in the conflict, and for "a settlement which would enable the people of North and South Vietnam to determine their own future".<sup>1</sup> This resolution made the social-democratic parties more active in the campaign for ending the war in Vietnam and meeting the legitimate rights of the Vietnamese people.

The anti-American sentiment within the Socialist International ranks began to surge after the military fascist coup of April 21, 1967, in Greece. The coup was denounced by the Socialist International.

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 9-10, 1966, p. 103.

The developments in Greece, which took place against the background of the growing protest against the US aggression in Vietnam, made the social-democratic parties, above all those in the NATO member countries, give more thought than ever before to the meaning and role of "Atlantic solidarity". The Western European countries, including those whose governments were headed by, or partially composed of, the leaders of social-democracy (as was the case, for instance, in Great Britain, the FRG, Denmark, Belgium, and Holland) turned out to play the role of accomplices both in the aggressive war in Vietnam and the fascist coup-d'état in Greece.

This, naturally, impelled the Social-Democrats to question the substance and goals of their policies. Anti-American sentiments in the Socialist International and its parties started to mount and the drive for an independent policy in the international arena intensified. Ample evidence of this can be found in statements by SI Chairman Bruno Pitterman, Olof Palme, a prominent figure in the International, the leaders of the Japanese Socialist Party, resolutions adopted by the Belgian Socialist Party, etc.

In its resolution "A New System of Collective Security", the Belgian Socialist Party noted with satisfaction the headway made in reducing East-West tensions. In order to accelerate and stabilise détente, the resolution stated, it was necessary to eliminate the existing military blocs and create a new form of collective security. The party stressed that Belgium's membership in NATO could only be continued if NATO pursued "a policy of rapprochement, of relaxation of tension and of disarmament".<sup>1</sup>

Thus, despite the opposition of the extreme right and pro-American and anti-Soviet elements a more realistic approach to the international situation and the reasons for tensions was taking shape in the Socialist International and its parties. This fostered positive shifts in the SI attitudes to foreign policy and international relations.

Leonid Brezhnev, addressing the 1967 Conference of European Communist and Workers' parties, said: "Under the pressure of the broad strata of the working class, the desire is growing in a number of European socialist and social-democratic parties to throw away the lumber of the cold war and to join the search for con-

structive solutions in the area of strengthening European security. We are aware of these new tendencies. They show that more favourable conditions are being created now for broader contacts with the social-democratic movement to promote a joint struggle of Communists and Social-Democrats against the partition of Europe into military blocs, for peace and social progress."<sup>1</sup>

Unfortunately, the development of positive shifts in the social-democratic parties and their International was hampered first by the 1967 armed conflict in the Middle East and then, to an even greater extent, by the 1968 developments in Czechoslovakia.

The Socialist International closely followed the developments in Czechoslovakia. Its journal published many materials on them, giving especially wide coverage to the invigoration of certain elements from among former Social-Democrats. The Czechoslovakian developments were discussed by the Socialist International's study group on East European problems as well as by the SI Bureau session held on July 1, 1968. The Socialist International and its parties acclaimed the activity of the Social-Democrats in Czechoslovakia and the social-democratic tendencies in the policy of the leadership of the Communist Party at the time.

The internationalist assistance rendered to Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries was used as a pretext for the anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaign launched by the social-democratic parties. The "Czechoslovakian question" was widely discussed at the conference of the SI Council which started on August 21, 1968 in Copenhagen. The resolution adopted at the conference denounced the action taken by the socialist countries, claiming that it posed "a grave threat to world peace".<sup>2</sup>

As subsequent developments were to show, the assessment of the situation given by the Socialist International was absolutely incorrect: in the late 1960s and early 1970s the world situation improved, instead of worsening, and the threat to world peace diminished considerably. Nonetheless, the Socialist International and its parties, owing to their erroneous interpretation of the character and consequences of the socialist countries' action in Czechoslovakia, found themselves in the same boat with the most blatant

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 12-13, 1967, pp. 134-35.

<sup>1</sup> Leonid Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course. Speeches and Articles*, Vol. 2, Politizdat, Moscow, 1970, pp. 20-21 (in Russian).

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 16-17, 1968, p. 139.

right-wing, anti-Soviet and anti-communist forces of the capitalist world.

Yet it is important to note that many social-democratic leaders, while denouncing the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, objected to reverting to the cold war policies, and supported detente efforts. For example, Harold Wilson, the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, said in a speech before the House of Commons on August 26, 1968: "Whatever the tragic disappointments of the last few days ... we all know that the only future for the world rests upon continuing to work for detente between East and West, and everything that a lowering of tension can bring."<sup>1</sup>

Similar sentiments prevailed among the delegates of the Eleventh SI Congress held from July 15 to 20, 1969 in Eastbourne, England. Although the atmosphere created by the anti-Soviet campaign encouraged quite a few speakers to make comments hostile to the Soviet Union and the communist parties, the main resolutions of the Congress on international issues testified to the Socialist International's and its parties' striving for a peaceful settlement of international conflicts, eased tensions, improved relations with Eastern countries, and for disarmament.

The Congress supported the socialist countries' proposal on convening a European Conference; it condemned the fascist regime in Greece and urged all the International's member parties to render assistance to the Greek Democrats. It also welcomed the cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam and the beginning of talks in Paris, expressed its full support to Dr. Gunnar Jarring's mission and its hope for the earliest possible peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem, welcomed the signing of the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and called on all nations to sign and ratify it as soon as possible; it urged all countries to accede to the treaty prohibiting nuclear weapon testing in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space and to struggle vigorously for universal and complete disarmament.

These and other resolutions of the 11th SI Congress attested to the fact that, although the war in the Middle East and the developments in Czechoslovakia had slowed down the development of positive shifts in social-democracy, they failed to bring to a complete stop the Socialist International's gradual advance

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 16-17, 1968, p. 202.

towards a more realistic assessment of international problems and more consistent action for peace and detente.

\* \* \*

The early 1970s witnessed momentous changes in the international situation—an about-face from cold war to detente. Of decisive importance here were the successes scored by world socialism and the consolidation of the international stature and the growing might of the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries, and their tireless efforts to normalise relations with the capitalist countries and to resolve all international problems by negotiation.

An important contribution to the improvement of the international situation was made by the peace champions in developed capitalist countries and in countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Of great importance were their extensive campaigns to urge the convening of a European Conference on Security and Co-operation, campaigns of solidarity with the Vietnamese people, as well as their work towards a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem, banning the production and testing of nuclear weapons, and for universal disarmament.

The social-democratic parties and the Socialist International itself played a positive role in easing international tensions, above all in Europe. Of particular consequence was the contribution of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany.

In the late 1960s-early 1970s the SPD leadership, headed by Willy Brandt, recognised the groundlessness and danger of the former course pursued by the Federal Republic of Germany. The SPD's new *Ostpolitik* proceeded from realities. SPD leaders holding the key positions in the FRG government consented to the Soviet proposals, and on August 12, 1970 signed a Treaty with the USSR based on recognition of the existing frontiers and the independence of the German Democratic Republic, non-interference in the affairs of other states and the settlement of all disputes by peaceful means. Subsequently, they signed treaties with Poland, the GDR and Czechoslovakia. This was a major success in ensuring European and international security.

The relaxation of international tension, the improvement of East-West relations, and the greater activity of peace forces in

capitalist countries had a strong impact on the social-democratic parties and the Socialist International, triggering positive shifts in their positions.

First of all, the Socialist International came to recognise the principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different socio-economic systems as the only sound basis of international relations. While in the past the leaders of the International pictured the policy of peaceful coexistence pursued by the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries as "tactical manoeuvring" calculated to deceive the peoples of the world and achieve "aggressive goals", now their attitude to the Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence had changed considerably. "In the face of the danger of mankind's self-destruction the question of coexistence has turned into the question of existence," said Willy Brandt. "Coexistence has become not merely one of many acceptable possibilities, but the only chance to survive."<sup>1</sup>

The leaders of the Socialist International declare that in the present-day conditions war cannot serve as a political lever, that the solution of international questions rests on detente, and that peace and peaceful coexistence are the most important prerequisite for social progress and for reaching the working-class movement's socialist goals. The SPD's tentative programme for 1975-1985 says: "A lasting and guaranteed peace is the necessary condition without which the aims of democratic socialism cannot be achieved. . . Only co-operation among all states, irrespective of their social system, can ensure peace."<sup>2</sup>

In the 1970s, the problems of peace and international security were the pivot of the Socialist International's activities. They were given careful consideration at the 12th, 13th and 14th congresses of the Socialist International and at various meetings and conferences of its leaders. Willy Brandt, elected new president of the International, described in his policy-making speech at the 13th Congress the struggle for a "secure peace" as a top-priority task. "Only an offensive for a secure peace," he said, "can guarantee a future for mankind."<sup>3</sup> The position of the President, shared by

<sup>1</sup> *Die Zukunft*, No. 1-2, January 1972, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Die ökonomisch-politischer Orientierungsrahmen für die Jahre 1975-1985*, Bonn, 1975, p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1977, p. 7.

other leaders of the Socialist International, was reflected in the resolution on the political situation.

Addressing the 14th SI Congress, Willy Brandt reiterated that detente, should it be interpreted and implemented correctly, could benefit all the countries of the world. He pointed out that the differences between countries with differing political systems and between their interests could not be removed either by an agreement or by compromise. Therefore, peace and detente could be ensured only by "the respect of sovereign rights and the renunciation of intervention in the internal affairs of other nations".<sup>1</sup>

The vested interest of the Socialist International and its parties in securing peace and detente was mirrored in speeches by other delegates and in the General Resolution adopted at the Congress. The resolution stressed that detente should not be interpreted as a concept of the status quo but rather as a concept of development. Its goal should consist not merely in easing East-West political confrontation but rather in laying a positive bedrock for the peaceful settlement of conflicts. Moreover, it should involve the development of co-operation among different countries.

There appeared signs of a serious change in the Socialist International leaders' evaluation of the Soviet Union's policy and role in the international arena; unlike their position in the cold war years they came to recognise the peace-loving nature of the policy pursued by the USSR and the other socialist community countries. This could be gathered from the declarations of the leaders of the social-democratic parties of Germany, Finland, France and other countries. The joint communiqué on the talks between the delegations of the CPSU and the French Socialist Party issued in April 1975 pointed out that the delegation of the French Socialist Party valued highly the Soviet Union's constructive contribution to international detente.

A new aspect in the foreign policy course of the social-democratic parties was their desire to develop co-operation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The SPD leadership encouraged the signing of important agreements between the governments of the FRG and the Soviet Union, including an agreement on trade, an agreement on the development of economic and technical co-operation, and an agreement on cultural co-operation.

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1979, p. 7.



The coming of the British Labour Party to power in 1974 gave an impetus to Soviet-British relations. In February 1975, the Labour Party's leader Harold Wilson visited the Soviet Union for the first time in years. The documents signed during the visit included the joint Soviet-British declaration, a long-term programme for the development of economic and industrial co-operation, a programme for scientific and technological co-operation, a Soviet-British protocol on consultations, etc. Describing the state of British-Soviet relations, Harold Wilson stressed that what united the USSR and Great Britain was more important and durable than what divided them. The Socialists and the Social-Democrats in other capitalist countries also supported the idea of expanding ties with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The position of the Socialist International and its member parties on the issues of European security also changed for the better. Whereas in the 1960s they were unsupportive of the socialist countries' proposals on convening a European Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, in the 1970s they came to back the idea.

The Helsinki Conference of the SI Council held in May 1971 and the 12th SI Congress held in June 1972 in Vienna gave careful consideration to the issue of a European Conference. It is significant that the Helsinki Conference was held on the initiative and invitation of the Finnish Social-Democratic Party, which was especially active in urging the earliest possible convening of a conference of all European countries.

In a report on this issue, Willy Brandt stressed the importance of a European Conference for peace in Europe and throughout the world. He pointed out that the Conference should discuss economic, technological and scientific co-operation among the European countries as well as a balanced reduction of arms and renunciation of the use of force. "The nations of Europe", he said, "should confirm their obligation to mould international relations on the basis of sovereign equality and the self-determination of nations, and to resolve by peaceful means any difficulties that may arise."<sup>1</sup>

The resolution adopted by the SI Conference noted the headway made in preparing for the conference and urged all the gov-

ernments and peoples in Europe and North America "to work for the holding of a Conference on European Security at an early date". The Socialist International stressed that "the 1970s should become an era of cooperation. The objective must be the ending of the cold war between East and West".<sup>1</sup>

The positive changes in the positions of the Socialist International recorded in the resolutions of the Helsinki Conference of the SI Council were reflected in and further elaborated during the proceedings of the 12th and 13th SI congresses.

The 13th Congress noted with satisfaction the success of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, stressing that the Final Act signed by all the states attending the conference marked an important stage in the development of East-West relations and strengthening European security. Finnish Social-Democratic Party Chairman Kalevi Sorsa, commenting on the importance of the Helsinki accords, pointed out that the Final Act should be regarded as a single entity, without any of its parts considered separately. Speaking about the Belgrade meeting to be held in the summer of 1977, he warned against turning this meeting into a kind of a tribunal at which the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act will be judged. "The most important thing," said Kalevi Sorsa, "would be to accomplish discussion and decisions on positive measures, by means of which the objectives set could be attained."<sup>2</sup> He drew attention to the Soviet Union's proposals to hold special conferences on energy, transport and environmental problems and noted that Finland supported these initiatives.

As the results of the European conference in Belgrade showed, the representatives of social-democratic governments, despite certain hesitation and inconsistency, on the whole endorsed continuing the course towards strengthening peace and security in Europe.

The 14th SI Congress stressed that the Helsinki Final Act, as well as the Belgrade meeting, provided a basis for further advance in securing detente in Europe. The resolution adopted at the Congress pointed out that in preparing for the next conference of European countries in Madrid everything should be done to make headway, through patient and persistent efforts, in solving concrete problems specified in the Helsinki agreement.

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 5-6, 1971, p. 101.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 109.

<sup>3</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1977, p. 17.



Detente and a healthier climate in Europe encouraged some Socialist International parties to discuss the idea of disbanding the military blocs and replacing them with a system of collective security. This idea was advanced or endorsed by the French Socialist Party, the Dutch Labour Party, and the social-democratic parties in Finland, Sweden, Switzerland and some other countries. The resolution of the April 1975 Congress of the Dutch Labour Party described the existing "security system" as "unstable and unsafe since it maintains in existence an increasingly intensified arms race". The resolution underscored the need for eliminating the existing military blocs and creating a new security system in Europe. The Congress declared: "A major objective of international socialist policy lies in the formation of united alliances, cutting across the power blocs, of all exploited and oppressed classes, races and peoples."<sup>1</sup>

New elements appeared in the position of the Socialist International and its parties as regards European integration, too. While in the 1950s and 1960s the "unity of Europe" was largely considered in the light of an anti-Soviet policy, in the 1970s priority came to be given to the interests and demands of the working class and other working strata. Special emphasis was now laid on the necessity for the socialist parties in the EEC countries to seek stronger "control by the people's representatives" over the Community's activity, to vigorously support workers' demands, ensure full employment and improve the workers' living and working conditions.

Some social-democratic leaders started to doubt that the European Economic Community could be instrumental in achieving the socialist goals as formulated by West European social-democracy. For example, Kalevi Sorsa stated at the 12th Congress of the International: "Neither as Finns nor as Socialists can we believe that the EEC and its enlargement is self-evidently a positive phenomenon. It is a very long way from the present EEC, dominated by the interests of capital, to a socialist community".<sup>2</sup>

The problems of European integration became particularly crucial in the late 1970s in connection with both the pernicious consequences of the 1974-1976 economic crisis and the direct elec-

tions to the European parliament scheduled for June 1979. They were discussed at the conference of the Confederation of Socialist Parties of the European Community countries held in January 1976 in Helsinki.

The debate revealed the differences among the social-democratic parties on the powers of the future Parliament and the prospects for the development of European integration. Some of the parties, particularly the SPD, were in favour of extending the rights of the Parliament and making it an effective instrument in furthering integration politically as well as economically. A number of other parties, especially Britain's Labour Party, resolutely opposed granting the European Parliament supra-national functions and insisted on retaining the sovereignty of national parliaments.<sup>1</sup>

Following the debate a Political Declaration was adopted which was to become, in effect, the pre-election policy statement of the Social-Democrats.

As to the future development of European integration, the Declaration records neither the point of view of the German SPD nor that of Britain's Labour Party. It neither directly opposes the extension of the powers of the EEC bodies in the political area, nor rules out the possibility for broadening their supra-national functions. At the same time, the Declaration comprises a number of positive aspects. It criticises the social system obtaining in the West European countries and its inability to solve numerous problems facing them, such as unemployment, and formulates the goal of "liberation of the individual".<sup>2</sup> "To achieve this objective," the Declaration says, "we must change the economic and social structures" in the EEC countries and ensure democratic control over the major industrial associations and transnational corporations, increase the role of the workers at enterprises and establish democracy both at individual enterprises and in the social economy as a whole.

Though including these demands, which met the interests of

<sup>1</sup> The statement adopted by the 1977 Conference of the British Labour Party declares: "Our objective is to work towards the creation of a wider but much looser grouping of European states—one in which each country is able to realise its own economic and social objectives under the sovereignty of its own Parliament (*Socialist Affairs*, No. 6, 1977, p. 161).

<sup>2</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 4, 1978, p. 101-03.

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 4, 1975, p. 72.

<sup>2</sup> *New Times*, No. 29, 1972, p. 20.

the working people, the authors of the Declaration do not clarify the ways to implement these goals amidst the domination of monopoly capital and transnational corporations in the EEC countries and bodies.

The foreign policy section of the document contains a number of important statements to the effect that the EEC should become a "factor of peace" and that the socialist parties support East-West detente. These and some other statements of the Political Declaration certainly took into account the demands of the working masses and could have made an important contribution to the elaboration of a common platform for co-operation among the left-wing forces in defending the interests of the workers, peace and social progress.

In the 1970s, the Socialist International started to give greater priority than in the past to the struggle against fascist regimes in European countries. The International repeatedly adopted resolutions condemning the fascist regimes in Spain and Portugal.

The social-democratic parties and the Socialist International also condemned the fascist regime in Greece and played a positive role in launching a large-scale campaign to support the anti-fascist struggle of the Greek people. The Social-Democrats expressed their concern over the role of NATO and "Atlantic solidarity" in maintaining fascist regimes in Europe and in the reactionary putsch carried out by the Greek fascist junta in Cyprus. In an article published in *Socialist Affairs*, Niels Matthiasen, a member of the Danish Social-Democratic Party, wrote that the Danish Social-Democrats were very much concerned about their membership in NATO, what with the political developments in Greece and Portugal. "In Greece", Matthiasen went on to say, "a fascist dictatorship has destroyed a budding democracy and the fascist dictatorship in Portugal has increased the suppression and exploitation of Portuguese Africa with the help of NATO and NATO-trained forces."<sup>1</sup> It goes without saying that similar sentiments were characteristic of Social-Democrats not only in Denmark but in other countries as well. Both the Socialist International's leaders and the rank-and-file Social-Democrats realised that the United States was especially active in supporting the fascist states. General Secretary Hans Janitschek wrote about this in no uncertain terms in his report for 1972.

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 8, 1971, p. 160.

The Socialist International condemned the military putsch effected in Cyprus on July 15, 1974 and the attempts to overthrow the legitimate government headed by Archbishop Makarios. It should be pointed out that the Socialist International had long before warned the public of the dangerous plans hatched by the Greek reactionaries. For instance, the Declaration of the SI Bureau adopted in March 1972 stressed that the Greek government, through its policy vis-à-vis Cyprus, jeopardised peace in the Mediterranean. "The International appeals to all democratic parties and governments," the Declaration ran, "strongly to oppose the Greek colonels' attempts to instigate a putsch in Cyprus and to avoid the creation of a new danger spot in the Mediterranean."<sup>2</sup>

When the putsch became a fait accompli, the International's leadership immediately condemned it as a violation of the sovereignty and independence of Cyprus, as an "outburst of violence committed by the fascist Greek military", and "a threat to peace in Europe and in the Middle East". The Socialist International declared its full support for the Democrats of Cyprus "defending their freedom and basic human rights against fascist aggression".<sup>3</sup>

When Turkish troops invaded the territory of Cyprus initiating the bloodshed between the two communities, the Socialist International took a stand which was generally in harmony with the demands for a peaceful settlement in the interests of the Cypriot people. The Declaration of the SI Bureau adopted in September 1974 called on the belligerents to desist from further bloodshed and hostilities, to allow the refugees to return to their homes, release the prisoners of war, withdraw Turkish troops and establish peace between the Greek and the Turkish communities so as to create an independent and democratic Cyprus.

In the late 1970s, the Socialist International focused primarily on disarmament. It was discussed in great detail at the 13th Congress of the Socialist International. Willy Brandt and other delegates spoke in favour of halting the arms race. "For the Socialist International," the Congress declared, "the ultimate objective continues to be that of general disarmament."<sup>4</sup> The Congress noted that disarmament and control over armaments and over

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 3, 1972, p. 50.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 3, 1974, p. 52.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1, 1977, p. 32.

trade in arms were of vital importance for the whole world amidst the accelerating arms race and the deteriorating economic situation in many countries. The Socialist International demanded a stop to the proliferation of nuclear weapons immediately, the establishment of control over nuclear arms and the exports and imports of fissionable materials and related equipment, a ban on nuclear weapon testing and the formation of nuclear-free zones. The Resolution of the 13th Congress pointed out that substantial progress in ensuring control over armaments could be made through reaching agreements on banning chemical and biological warfare and prohibiting the use of weaponry capable of destroying the environment.

The Socialist International stressed the expediency of an early agreement on limiting strategic arms between the United States and the Soviet Union (SALT-2) since it would not only foster better relations between the two great powers but also provide better prerequisites for reducing conventional armaments. The Congress emphasised the importance of reaching an agreement on a mutual reduction of armed forces at the Vienna talks. It is vital, said Willy Brandt, "that the Vienna negotiations . . . be released from the paralysis of the expert talks and given new impetus at a high political level."<sup>1</sup>

The Madrid session of the SI Bureau held in October 1977 considered the problems of disarmament in even greater detail. Willy Brandt made a report on the principles underlying the Socialist International's stand on the issue. He said that there was no realistic alternative to the policy of detente. Detente, he underlined, can only be carried on provided effective agreements are reached in the military area and political detente is complemented with military detente.<sup>2</sup> However, the results of the Madrid discussions showed that the Socialist International lacked unanimity on the issues in question. The representatives of SI parties from Scandinavian and Mediterranean countries held that the attainment of military detente in Europe and the negotiations on arms control as a whole should not be bound up with the Soviet-American talks on limiting strategic arms. Britain's Labour Party and the SPD, on the contrary, maintained that the talks on military detente in

Europe should be seen as a component of the overall negotiations and that the success of talks on the control over and the reduction of the military forces in Europe rested on the success of the SALT-2 negotiations. Owing to such differences in their stands the SI parties failed to formulate a common programme on disarmament.

The Helsinki Conference on disarmament held in April 1978 was a milestone in the activity of the Socialist International. It was the first conference in the Socialist International's history to be specially devoted to disarmament. Although the social-democratic parties arrived at the Conference without a common platform, the Conference nonetheless illustrated the general desire of the Social-Democrats in various countries to stop the arms race and explore ways to reduce armed forces. "At a time when any large-scale war can bring mankind to the edge of its existence," Willy Brandt said, "the energetic striving for arms control and reduction of armaments becomes categorically imperative."<sup>3</sup>

The leaders of some social-democratic parties, while supporting the general statements on the need for disarmament, laid special emphasis on the inadmissibility of developing new types of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction, specifically, the neutron bomb. "The neutron bomb," said Olof Palme, "is . . . an exceedingly dangerous weapon, not only because of the devastating injury it causes but also because it can lead military strategists to believe that nuclear wars can be limited and controlled and that they can be won. In actual fact, it increases the risks of a nuclear war."<sup>4</sup> Finns, Kalevi Sorsa observed, were following with deep concern the development of the neutron bomb. "We strongly urge," he said, "that these decisions be abandoned for the sake of detente."<sup>5</sup> This point of view is generally shared by the Social-Democrats in Norway, the Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland and a number of other countries.

The Helsinki Conference was highlighted by the fact that, for the first time in the history of the Socialist International, it was attended by an official delegation of the Soviet Union headed by an alternate member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1977, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> See: *Socialist Affairs*, No. 6, 1977, p. 162.

<sup>3</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 4, 1978, p. 94.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 82.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80.

CPSU Central Committee, Boris N. Ponomarev. The head of the Soviet delegation had an opportunity to set forth the point of view of the Soviet Communist Party and Government on disarmament and make concrete proposals on developing co-operation between the CPSU and the Socialist International in the field. On behalf of the CPSU, he invited a delegation of the Socialist International to come to Moscow to discuss the issue of curbing the arms race and carrying out subsequent disarmament and to consider the possibilities for joint action.

The speech by Boris Ponomarev was listened to with great attention. Later, at the 14th SI Congress, Bernt Carlsson said that the proposals advanced by the Soviet Union "should be discussed in a serious way". He emphasised that "the time is past when such proposals could be treated just by silence".<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the SI Helsinki Conference signalled a new step forward in the Socialist International's efforts towards disarmament.

In May 1978, in line with the resolution adopted by the Helsinki Conference, the SI Bureau set up a Study Group on Disarmament comprised of representatives of the Austrian Socialist Party, the British Labour Party, the Dutch Labour Party, the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, the French Socialist Party, the Finnish Social-Democratic Party, the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, the Japanese Socialist Party, the Japan Democratic Socialist Party, the Socialist Party of Senegal, the Democratic Action Party of Venezuela and the General Secretary of the Socialist International. Kalevi Sorsa was appointed chairman of the Study Group. Commenting on the responsibilities of the Group *Socialist Affairs*, wrote: "The Study Group is especially charged with studying proposals made during the SI Conference on Disarmament by Boris N. Ponomarev, Head of the International Department of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."<sup>2</sup>

The SI Study Group on Disarmament visited Moscow in late September-early October 1979. During the delegation's stay in Moscow a number of important questions related to the struggle for peace and the relaxation of international tension were discus-

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1979, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 5, 1978, p. 112.

sed. (For details on the visit see Chapter Five of the book).

The 14th Congress of the Socialist International was held in Vancouver in November 1978. Just as the previous congresses, it focused on the problems of peace and disarmament.

Speaking at the Congress, Willy Brandt stressed that disarmament in the previous two years had been pivotal for the SI. He informed the delegates that the Study Group instituted by the SI Bureau in May 1978 was "about to work out proposals for concrete initiatives" to be submitted for the consideration of the parties and the next SI Congress to be held in 1980. "I urge you to give support to their efforts wherever possible," said Brandt, addressing the leaders of social-democratic parties, "to give continued review to what our individual parties can do in the interest of détente and disarmament."<sup>1</sup> The Congress expressed its support for the idea of ending the arms race, for disarmament, control over the armed forces and the reduction of military expenditures. Special emphasis was laid on the need to ban nuclear weapons and further improvements in their production technology. The Socialist International voiced concern over the danger of an increasing number of nuclear countries and fully supported the agreement on creating a nuclear-free zone in Latin America as well as the projects for reaching similar agreements in Africa and Asia. "No considerations of short-term economic advantage," the SI resolution said, "can be allowed to increase the risk of nuclear proliferation."<sup>2</sup>

The 1970s witnessed certain changes in the attitude of some social-democratic parties towards the United States and its foreign policy. More and more Social-Democrats recognised that unconditional support of US policy could drag them into adventures fraught with a threat to world peace and the interests of their own nations.

Repeated appeals were heard among the Western European Social-Democrats to end the excessive dependence of Western Europe on the United States and to chart an independent policy. The 1973 Memorandum issued by a committee of the Danish Social-Democratic Party says: "...the committee holds that sooner or later Europe must get rid of US influence through a collective security sys-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1, 1979, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

tem, and that such a system can be achieved, can be set up only provided the American influence is removed."<sup>1</sup> The same idea was expressed in the resolution adopted by the 1973 Congress of the French Socialist Party. Commenting on the implications of this resolution, Robert Pontillon wrote that the socialists "will also strive for an independent Europe", since the latter was "threatened in the immediate future by the commercial dictates of American imperialism".<sup>2</sup> Felipe González, General Secretary of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, addressing the December 1977 Congress of his party, urged the government to renounce the Spanish-US treaty on American military bases in Spain as it subordinated the country's foreign policy to US interests.

The economic crisis of 1974-1976 considerably enhanced anti-American sentiment among the Social-Democrats. The mounting economic and financial difficulties plaguing the capitalist countries and the increased rivalry between them for markets and raw material (especially oil) resources led to the exacerbation of contradictions among imperialist powers, to the growing desire of many governments, headed or participated in by social-democratic leaders, to safeguard their national interests, restrict the influence of US-based transnational corporations and acquire greater financial, economic and political freedom.

Attitudes of the socialist parties to the United States were discussed at the Paris Conference of representatives of a number of SI parties in Western and Southern Europe held in January 1976. The speakers emphasised the need for pursuing a new strategy aimed primarily at elaborating, both for their countries and for Western Europe as a whole, a policy independent from the United States.

The relaxation of international tension enabled Social-Democrats to undertake a more objective analysis of the problems of international relations and foreign policy. Many Socialist International leaders became increasingly conscious of the unseemly role of US imperialism's ally which had been played by the social-democratic parties over the years. Some of them began to insist, just as they did in the early postwar years, on a more independent policy.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in: *World Marxist Review*, No. 6, June 1975, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 5, 1973, p. 9.

Alan J. Day, former editor of the SI journal *Socialist Affairs*, commented on this in no uncertain terms, stressing that the cold war and the resultant polarisation of forces led to the Social-Democrats supporting the foreign policy of the Western powers. "When East-West relations were bad," he wrote, "social democrats were faced with the stark option of either concurring with establishment thinking on international affairs or laying themselves open to the charge of being agents of the Kremlin."<sup>1</sup> As is well known, Social-Democrats chose to "concur with establishment thinking", that is, with the policy pursued by the ruling classes in Western Europe and the United States, and abandoned their efforts towards an independent foreign policy course.

The relaxation of international tension, Alan Day noted, created now conditions favourable for an independent social-democratic policy. "With the rapid progress of détente in the late 'sixties," he stressed, "social democrats were again able to take up their natural position on the middle ground."<sup>2</sup>

The fact that the "third force" concept again drew the attention of European social-democracy testified to important changes in the Socialist International's approach to international problems.

The anti-Soviet, anti-communist implication of the "third force" concept is not something new for Social-Democrats. What is really novel is the greater desire of the social-democratic parties to reduce their dependence on US imperialism, to avoid involvement in the notorious US actions undermining peace and democracy, to influence the course of world development more effectively, and to promote social-democratic goals proper both in individual countries and in the world as a whole.

The overall results of the activities of the Socialist International and its major parties in the years under consideration can be viewed as positive. The Socialist International and social-democratic parties made a no small contribution to achieving détente, strengthening European security, improving East-West relations, and developing ties and various forms of co-operation between East and West.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1, 1973, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

\* \* \*

The early 1980s witnessed a sharp aggravation of international tensions caused by the policies of the US Administration and its allies. It became obvious that the most aggressive quarters in the United States and other Western powers were not pleased with detente, the normalisation of relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries, the limitation of the arms race, and disarmament.

As the developments of the period proved, during the years of detente the might and influence of the socialist states grew considerably, while the liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America scored great successes and the working-class and democratic movements in the capitalist countries became more active.

At the same time, Western countries were engulfed by an economic crisis marked by declining industrial growth, soaring unemployment and inflation, exacerbated social and economic contradictions, mounting discontent and more intensive class struggle. Moreover, the contradictions among the United States, Western Europe and Japan became more acute, while the tendency of some Western European countries to pursue a foreign policy of greater independence from the United States became more pronounced. The problems of military budgets, disarmament, European security, the Middle East settlement, relations with the Soviet Union and the developing countries caused controversy within NATO.

These developments did not suit the ruling classes in capitalist countries, above all in the United States. They took pains to reverse the situation: to impede the growth of the socialist countries' strength, hamper the mounting liberation struggle waged by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, overcome economic difficulties and ensure a change in the alignment of forces in the world in their favour.

Behind the talk about the alleged "Soviet threat", "Soviet interference" in other countries' internal affairs and the policy of "international terrorism" supposedly pursued by the Soviet government, President Reagan and his Administration seek to attain military superiority over the Warsaw Treaty countries by escalating the arms race, increasing military expenditures and developing new types of weaponry. They are pinning special hopes on deploy-

ing American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe and thereby altering the balance of forces in the region in their favour. It is for this reason that the US President has refused to ratify the SALT-2 Treaty and torpedoed negotiations on a number of other problems involved in disarmament. The United States is allocating considerable funds and equipment to boost its potential in the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean, it is creating "rapid deployment forces" and establishing new military bases in Egypt, the Sudan, Kenya, Somalia, Oman, Pakistan and other countries.

The US leaders are exerting greater pressure on the NATO countries and Japan, urging them to increase their military budgets, support the project of deploying US missiles in Europe, adopt new rearmament programmes, etc. The United States seeks to employ economic as well as military means of struggle against the socialist countries, including the policy of sanctions, economic blockade and ideological campaigns launched under the motto of defending "human rights" and combatting "international terrorism". Particular emphasis in the US strategy of undermining the positions of world socialism is laid on capitalising on the difficulties and errors in the development of individual socialist countries.

Lastly, the period in question is marked by the growing activity of US imperialism in the struggle against the revolutionary and national liberation forces in the countries of Asia (Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Iran), the Middle East (Syria, Lebanon, the PLO), Africa (Angola, Mozambique, SWAPO), Latin America (Cuba, Nicaragua, El Salvador, etc.).

The increased imperialist activity of the US Administration and the reactionary forces in other Western countries promoted international tension, boosted the arms race and endangered world peace and security.

What is the position of the Socialist International and its leading parties in these circumstances? Unfortunately, the leaders of the Socialist International have been affected to a certain extent by the anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaign launched by the United States. They denounced the Soviet Union's military assistance to Afghanistan that country needed to defend its freedom and independence, as well as the extraordinary measures taken by the Polish authorities to prevent the further aggravation of the



economic and political crisis in their country. A number of SI parties supported the US plans to deploy new American missiles in Western Europe. Certain social-democratic parties and governments in the NATO countries (first of all in the FRG and France) agreed, although not at once, to the US demands for "rearmament", modernising armaments and increasing military budgets.

Nor can one overlook the tendency of the Socialist International and its parties to picture the United States and the Soviet Union as being equally responsible for the aggravation of international tensions, the arms race and many international problems going unsolved. Moreover, in defiance of well-known facts, the leaders of the Socialist International are pushing through the idea that the Soviet Union and the United States take the same stand on the problem of the so-called "limited nuclear war". The Social-Democrats make wide use of the concept of "two super-powers" which implies that the Soviet Union and the United States pursue identical policies in the international arena.

All this shows that the aggravation of international tension has had a negative effect on the social-democratic parties and the Socialist International, rendering their leaders at times incapable of giving an unbiased, objective assessment of the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and the militarist policy of the United States, on the other. This is reflected, among other things, in the fact that the Socialist International and its parties often pass over in silence the numerous concrete initiatives advanced by the CPSU and the Soviet Government aimed at safeguarding peace and international security.

However, while taking notice of these negative aspects in the stand taken by the Socialist International and social-democratic parties, one cannot overlook the fact that, on the whole, the Socialist International has remained loyal to the course towards strengthening peace, detente and disarmament it embarked upon in the 1970s.

Ample evidence of this was provided by the 15th SI Congress held in November 1980 in Madrid. Willy Brandt, Kalevi Sorsa, Bernt Carlsson and other leaders of the Socialist International came out in favour of peace and detente and against returning to cold war policies. "We are," declared Willy Brandt, "above all, the worldwide party of peace." He added: "... a relapse into cold war would signify much more than merely a return to the

ominous situation in the 1950s."<sup>1</sup> The resolution of the 15th Congress stresses that "there is no alternative to the process of detente".<sup>2</sup>

The Congress deliberations were focused on the problems of disarmament. Kalevi Sorsa, who had headed the SI Study Group on Disarmament, informed the delegates of the main results of the Group's work and submitted the report prepared by it to the Congress. The report stresses the urgent need for halting the arms race and the importance of fresh efforts aimed at achieving concrete results.

The report of the Study Group on Disarmament, as well as the speeches of the delegates, centred on nuclear disarmament. The representatives of West European social-democratic parties condemned the US doctrine of the so-called limited nuclear war. Alex Kitson, Chairman of the British Labour Party, emphasised that the doctrine was especially dangerous for Western Europe.

The idea of turning the whole of Europe into a nuclear-free zone, which had been formulated by the British and Belgian Socialists, was again thrashed out at the Congress. "The long-range objective is clear," said Kalevi Sorsa, "all nuclear weapons should be withdrawn from this continent. The idea of nuclear-weapon-free zones will come into focus in regional and subregional security efforts."<sup>3</sup>

The leaders of the Socialist International and its parties were greatly concerned over the unwillingness of the US Administration to ratify the SALT-2 Treaty. They noted the connection between the ratification of the treaty and the NATO decision on deploying new American medium-range missiles in Europe. "The refusal of the United States to recognize the treaty creates a new situation," said Max van der Stoep of the Dutch Labour Party. He added: "We cannot sit back and wait for what the new American Administration will do. We believe that the European allies of the United States should consult with one another and undertake the necessary steps to convince America of the importance

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1980, pp. 6, 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> *New Times*, No. 49, 1980, p. 19.

of the treaty. It would be a disaster if the SALT process were to be disrupted. It must be continued."<sup>1</sup>

This view was supported by other participants in the Congress and reflected in the resolution they adopted. "...the Socialist International," declares the Resolution, "renews its appeal for the ratification of the treaty and an early beginning to serious negotiations on SALT III. Failure to do so will have a negative impact on peace and security, and on negotiations to limit theatre nuclear weapons in Europe."<sup>2</sup>

The Congress discussed peace and security in Europe in great detail. Mindful of the great importance of conferences on the problems of European co-operation, the Congress welcomed the understanding reached on the agenda of the forthcoming Madrid Conference. The participants emphasised the necessity of reaching positive results at the Madrid Conference and, specifically, the significance of adopting a resolution on holding a European conference on disarmament. The Congress again drew the attention of the social-democratic parties and the European public to the Vienna talks on reducing the armed forces and armaments of European countries. The resolution of the 15th Congress declares that decisive political changes at the Vienna talks are to be effected in order to pave the way for reducing the military potential while maintaining a mutual balance of forces in that region of the world where the greatest number of armed forces are concentrated.<sup>3</sup>

The leaders of West European social-democracy reiterated the importance of consolidating the unity of their countries and pursuing a policy that would be less dependent on the United States. In this connection the resolution of the Congress declares: "In its relationship with the United States, Western Europe will have to stress its own interests and responsibilities overall, and especially in the field of peace and security."<sup>4</sup>

While underscoring the importance of solving the problems of disarmament, some of the members of the Socialist International pointed out that there existed a dangerous gap between the reso-

lutions of the International and the practical activity of certain ruling social-democratic parties. For example, Bernt Carlsson, General Secretary of the Socialist International, emphasised in his report to the 15th Congress: "The fact that the NATO decision on eurostrategic weapons was, by and large, supported by our member parties in government in the concerned countries is an unfortunate illustration of the lack of capacity of the Socialist International to transfer the call for disarmament into action."<sup>5</sup>

Since the Study Group on Disarmament had accomplished its task, it was decided to create an Advisory Council on the problems of disarmament and arms control. The Advisory Council was to be headed by Kalevi Sorsa and to continue the work started by the Study Group. Among other things, the Council was to re-establish ties with the leadership in the Soviet Union and the United States, the leaders of the non-aligned movement and the UN Secretary General and to search for acceptable ways of attaining disarmament. The Advisory Council made known its intention to develop contacts with trade-union and public organisations and movements advocating peace and disarmament.

Thus, by and large, the resolutions of the 15th SI Congress on the problems of peace and disarmament were realistic and constructive. They reflected the growing concern of the peoples, especially those in Europe, about the future of peace and detente and their striving for an end to the arms race.

In February 1981, the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was held. It charted a comprehensive programme of strengthening peace and solving urgent international problems, first of all those pertaining to disarmament. The Congress reaffirmed the Soviet proposal on stopping the production of nuclear weapons and reducing their stocks up to their complete liquidation. The Soviet Union again came out in favour of banning all other means of mass destruction (chemical, radiological, neutron and others). The CPSU Congress voiced its support for the desire of the peoples of the world to establish nuclear-free zones in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Indian Ocean. The USSR proposed making wider use in Europe of confidence-building measures in the military area in line with the Helsinki accords and reaching an agreement on similar measures for the Far East. The

<sup>1</sup> *New Times*, No. 49, 1980, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1981, p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> See: *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1981, pp. 21-22.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1981, p. 12.

Congress expressed the Soviet Union's readiness for the immediate commencement of negotiations with the United States on strategic arms and on limiting any other types of weapons. Desirous of leading the talks on nuclear missiles in Europe out of an impasse, the Soviet government proposed a moratorium on the deployment of new NATO and Soviet medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe.

The striving of the Soviet Union for peace, disarmament and negotiation, graphically demonstrated by the 26th CPSU Congress had a great impact on the world public, including the Social-Democrats and the leaders of their parties and organisations.

The anti-war sentiment and opposition to the US and NATO military plans among Western European Social-Democrats grew considerably. The British Labour Party adopted a special resolution to endorse the Soviet initiatives on confidence-building measures. The February 1981 Congress of the Dutch Labour Party adopted a resolution spearheaded against deploying US medium-range and other nuclear missiles on Dutch territory. The resolution adopted by the conference of the socialist parties of Japan, Australia, New Zealand and Malaysia held in February 1981 calls for an immediate end to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Pacific.

A meeting of social-democratic leaders and military experts from NATO's smaller member countries—Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Denmark and Norway—was held in March 1981. According to *Socialist Affairs*, the participants in the meeting were agreed that the Soviet initiatives on reducing nuclear arms in Europe were "interesting and should be studied more closely".<sup>1</sup> The meeting supported the resolution of the Dutch and Belgian Socialists to renounce the deployment of new American missiles in their countries.

A campaign against the NATO decision of 1979 to deploy new American nuclear missiles was launched in some of the social-democratic parties whose leaders supported the decision. It gathered the greatest momentum in the SPD of Germany. Many of the SPD chapters demanded a revision of the NATO decision. The Baden-Württemberg SPD chapter, for instance, was among

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 3, 1981, p. 116.

the organisations opposing the nuclear missile plans. Willy Brandt praised this position, describing it as an important contribution to the cause of limiting the arms race. The SPD Chairman referred to the US demands to further increase the FRG's military expenditures by cutting allocations for social needs as "patently absurd". He described the actions of those people from the US President's circle who take the liberty of instructing the FRG on how to chart its budget as impudence.

The conference of the leaders of social-democratic parties held in April 1981 in Amsterdam discussed, among other major issues, the question of East-West relations. Addressing the Conference Willy Brandt stressed that it was most important to renew the negotiation process. Some of the participants in the Conference pointed out that the main obstacle to the talks was the policy of the US Administration aimed at intensifying the arms race and attaining military superiority over the Warsaw Treaty countries. For example, the leader of the Dutch Labour Party, Joop den Uyl, said: "Foreign policy threatens to be militarised more and more. It seems as if the United States does not want to negotiate on arms control and arms limitation because it has strengthened its military power."<sup>1</sup>

The social-democratic leaders agreed that it was vital to invigorate their own activity and that of the Socialist International and its Advisory Council on Disarmament and prevent a further deterioration of the international situation, salvage detente and promote the resumption of talks between the United States and the USSR both on strategic arms and, especially, on the deployment of new nuclear missiles in Europe.

On May 1, 1981 the Socialist International issued an appeal entitled "There Are No Alternatives to Disarmament". It stresses that the arsenals of the world have enough arms to eliminate mankind and the environment many times over. Nonetheless, almost half of the world's scientists engaged in technological areas fully devote their efforts to military matters. An increasing part of the world's income and labour is channeled to military production. Noting that "new and increasingly deadly weapons are bringing the threat of a major explosion nearer day by day", the Socialist International, the Appeal says, "calls on every person all over the

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 4, 1981, p. 128.

world to work against this development and for disarmament, peace and progress. . . Only the firm determination of the peoples of the world to choose another way, the way of security and co-operation guaranteed by international agreements, can alter the course of development."<sup>1</sup>

The Socialist International's appeal reflected the concern of millions of people over the aggravation of tensions throughout the world, growing military expenditure and the stepped-up arms race. It testified to the commitment of the Socialist International's leaders to the cause of peace and disarmament and their striving to contribute to the struggle for international security and disarmament.

Attaching great importance to personal contacts with Soviet leaders, Willy Brandt visited Moscow in the summer of 1981 to meet Leonid Brezhnev. Speaking at a press conference in Moscow, he said: "I have no doubt that the Soviet leaders, and Leonid Brezhnev above all, want what they say. Not everywhere are people aware of this. This is not to say that I fully approve of every step in the Soviet foreign policy of the past few years. But I shall tell everybody who is willing to listen to me that people in the USSR do strive for preserving peace and undertake necessary steps towards it."<sup>2</sup>

The Presidium of the Socialist International meeting on July 15-16, 1981 in Bonn endorsed the results of the SI Chairman's visit. It is significant that *Socialist Affairs*, the organ of the Socialist International, gave wide coverage to Brandt's meeting with Brezhnev, describing it as a meeting of "the architects of detente in the 1970s".<sup>3</sup> In contradistinction to its usual practices, the SI journal published the texts of the speeches made by Leonid Brezhnev and Willy Brandt at the official luncheon.

The session of the SI Bureau held on September 24-25, 1981 in Paris focused on the international situation and especially on East-West relations. It revealed two different approaches to assessing the existing situation and the reasons for tensions both in Europe and the rest of the world.

Lionel Jospin, First Secretary of the French Socialist Party, who

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 3, 1981, pp. 106, 107.

<sup>2</sup> *Pravda*, July 3, 1981.

<sup>3</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 5, 1981, p. 172.

opened the discussion, spoke on the importance of the overall balance of military forces and the necessity of talks. However, he reduced the reason for the aggravation of tension in Europe to the Soviet Union's deploying its SS-20 missiles. Therefore, he saw the key to solving the major problems to lie in finding "a firm, determined solution of the SS-20 problem".<sup>1</sup>

The leader of the British Labour Party, Michael Foot struck a different note. He had visited Moscow a short while before and discussed the problems in question with Leonid Brezhnev. At the Bureau session Michael Foot declared that the Soviet Union was fully aware of the danger inherent in the existing situation and was striving for security and equality rather than superiority. The Soviet Union, he stressed, opposed the idea of a limited nuclear war and was "as much against neutron bombs as we are".<sup>2</sup> He did not share the opinion that the Soviet Union was spurring the arms race by deploying the SS-20 missiles.

In its resolution the SI Bureau urged an end to the arms race and the resumption of disarmament process, especially in the area of nuclear weapons. The International assailed the production and deployment of the neutron bomb and spoke in favour of the actual reduction of theatre nuclear arms of both sides in Europe. The Socialist International also supported the idea of the immediate resumption of the SALT process, stressing that "the next target of the continued talks should be deep cuts in existing weapons arsenals and an effective control of qualitative development of new arms systems."<sup>3</sup>

The resolution also urged the immediate banning of chemical and bacteriological arms, so as to prevent a new round in the arms race in this area.

The Socialist International expressed its satisfaction with the beginning of negotiations between the USA and the USSR in Geneva and warned its member parties against undertaking "any action anywhere in whatever form which might endanger the outcome of the negotiations".<sup>4</sup>

The International spoke in favour of limiting the trade in arms, especially with the developing countries, and welcomed the efforts

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 6, 1981, p. 207.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

towards establishing nuclear-free zones, particularly in the Pacific and Northern Europe. Thus, the Socialist International's positions were generally in harmony with the interests of the struggle for peace, detente and disarmament.

Autumn 1981 witnessed mass anti-war demonstrations in various Western European countries which acquired a scale unheard of in the past few years. They were highlighted by the fact that they involved representatives of a great variety of parties and public organisations united by a sincere desire to protect the world against the danger of a new war and to force the governments in all countries to embark on the road of peace and negotiations. The demonstrations staged in the capitals of various countries, among them Bonn, Paris, Rome and London, urged governments not to permit the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe, to stop the arms race and initiate talks on limiting strategic and other arms.

On September 13, 1981, 30,000 citizens of West Berlin participated in a demonstration of protest against the US policy jeopardising the future of the world. Sponsored by more than 60 youth, public, political and religious organisations, this demonstration was the largest in West Berlin in the last few years.

On October 10, 1981 a peace demonstration unprecedented in the FRG's history was held in Bonn. It involved more than 250,000 participants representing various parties and public organisations. The call to fight against the threat of nuclear war, for disarmament and detente, against the deployment of new medium-range missiles in Europe was supported by more than 830 West German organisations. Despite pressure from above, the demonstration attracted thousands of Social-Democrats, including the SPD deputies of the Bundestag.

On October 24, 1981, more than 250,000 demonstrators went out into the streets of London to protest against the US and NATO nuclear plans and to show their determination to safeguard peace. The impressive march, which lasted for over five hours, involved Labourites and Communists, Liberals and non-party peace champions. The demonstration was organised by the British movement for nuclear disarmament and supported by 80 other anti-war organisations, including trade unions, women's, youth and religious organisations.

A large-scale national Peace March of 150,000 people from

many cities, towns and villages all over Italy was staged on October 24, 1981 in Rome. Among the marchers were members of parliament, mayors of 22 Italian cities, thousands of factory and office workers, peasants and intellectuals espousing different political beliefs.

Numerous demonstrations and other anti-war actions took place in Scandinavian countries and elsewhere in Western Europe.

The powerful upsurge of the anti-war movement in Europe had an impact on the positions of a number of social-democratic parties. This was especially manifest in the resolutions adopted by the 80th Conference of Britain's Labour Party held in late September-early October 1981. In its resolution on disarmament the party called for a considerable reduction in military expenditures, rejecting the plans to re-equip British submarines with US Trident missiles, and opposing the deployment of cruise missiles, neutron or any other type of nuclear weapons in Britain. The Conference reaffirmed the previous Labour decision to work towards having all nuclear bases dismantled in Great Britain, approved of the initiatives of Labour-led municipal councils to announce the territories in their charge nuclear-free zones, and voiced its support for the movement for nuclear disarmament throughout the world.

The peace initiatives and detente were supported by the 29th Congress of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party held in October 1981. The Congress emphasised that the main method of overcoming differences should be negotiation rather than confrontation. The party reiterated its disapproval of the government's plans to drag Spain into NATO. The Congress called for broadening the campaign for peace, detente, disarmament and closer co-operation among nations.

By all accounts, US policy now came under harsher criticism in statements made by a number of prominent figures in Western European social-democratic parties and the Socialist International. The Chairman of the Social-Democratic Labour Party of Sweden, Olof Palme, commenting on the policy pursued by the US Administration, noted that the United States was seeking to build up NATO's potential in order to gain unilateral superiority as a crutch in its negotiations with the Soviet Union.

Alex Kitson, Chairman of the National Executive Committee of Britain's Labour Party, sharply criticised the US leadership for its refusal to ratify the SALT-2 Treaty.

Many leaders of Western European social-democracy, such as Bruno Kreisky, denounced the US President's statements on the possibility of limited nuclear warfare.

Even those leaders of Western European social-democracy who generally supported the US projects for rearmament and deploying new nuclear missiles in Europe, among them FRG Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and French President François Mitterrand, criticised the US Administration's economic policy.

At the same time many leaders of the Socialist International and its member parties recognised the peace-loving nature of the policy pursued by the Soviet Union, its sincere desire to preserve peace and detente, to engage in constructive negotiations on disarmament, and to develop co-operation among different states. British Labour Party leader Michael Foot, addressing a Party Conference held on September 30, 1981, said that the talks he had just had in Moscow in September left him convinced that the Soviet leaders wanted and were prepared to engage in constructive negotiation. The same, he said, cannot be said for the other side. He emphasised that the US government or rather the more influential forces in it display no readiness for the talks.<sup>1</sup>

Fenner Brockway, a member of the British Labour Party and a veteran of the European social-democratic movement, commenting on the importance of the Soviet proposal to declare the first use of nuclear weapons a grave crime against humanity said that if the Western leaders were sincerely intent on avoiding a nuclear conflict they should support the draft resolution to this effect in the United Nations.<sup>2</sup>

Quite a different opinion was formed about US policy by the representatives of the SI Advisory Council on Disarmament who visited Washington in November 1981. First of all, neither the President nor any other key Administration officials wished to meet the delegation. Moreover, the talks the delegation had in Washington showed that the US leaders took greater interest in armament than in disarmament. Secretary of the Social-Democratic Party of Finland Pentti Väänänen wrote: "The way and level of receiving the Council clearly showed that in Washington the dialogue with democratic socialists is today considered

<sup>1</sup> See: *Pravda*, October 2, 1981.

<sup>2</sup> See: *Izvestia*, December 17, 1981.

less important and useful than earlier. It also was clearly stated by the hosts that in some issues they disagreed with the Socialist International. Some of them even found us very dangerous. Neither is disarmament as high on the agenda as it used to be; it is surpassed by efforts to strengthen the military and political power of the country."<sup>3</sup>

Thus, the events of 1981 prove that European social-democracy and the Socialist International had clearly become more critical of US foreign policy and heightened their opposition to the arms race, the development of new types of weapons and the deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe. Anti-war sentiments developed not only among the rank-and-file Social-Democrats but also among the more prominent figures in socialist parties and organisations.

All this had definite influence upon the US leaders. They were compelled to consent to the talks with the Soviet Union on the Euromissiles and to announce that after the necessary preparations they would start talks on the problem of strategic arms, too. However, as subsequent developments were to show, the US representatives at the Geneva talks advanced wittingly unrealistic proposals, demanding in effect that the Soviet Union undertake unilateral disarmament.

Moreover, in a bid to stem the tide of anti-war and anti-US protests in Western Europe and to diminish the attractiveness of the Soviet peace and disarmament initiatives, the reactionary forces in the United States and other capitalist countries launched a new and unprecedented anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaign in connection with the aggravation of the political crisis in Poland and the December 1981 decision of the Polish authorities to introduce martial law. This measure, undertaken by the Polish government in full conformity with the Polish Constitution and aimed at easing tensions and socio-economic difficulties in the country, was portrayed by the reactionary forces in the United States and other Western countries as a violation of "human rights" and the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference. Accusations were levelled not only at the Polish government but also at the Soviet Union, which, by rendering support to the Polish government and the Polish United Workers' Party, had allegedly violated "human rights" in Poland.

<sup>3</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1982, p. 8.



On this false plea, the US President imposed economic sanctions against the Polish People's Republic and the Soviet Union. He then brought powerful pressure to bear on Western countries to associate themselves with the US policy of sanctions. The US succeeded in compelling the NATO member countries (except Greece) to adopt on January 11, 1982 a resolution censuring the Polish and Soviet governments.

This campaign had a negative impact upon the social-democratic parties and the Socialist International. It fostered mistrust and prejudice towards the Soviet Union and the Communists, and rendered some of the social-democratic leaders and rank-and-file members more susceptible to the influence of the bourgeois propaganda media's distortions about Soviet foreign policy, the situation in Poland and other countries of the socialist community. The Presidium of the Socialist International passed a special resolution on the Polish developments which differed very insignificantly from the declarations made by the bourgeois leaders and governments.

However, the US efforts to make their Western European allies subscribe to the policy of sanctions, specifically, to support the US demand that the well-known "gas-pipe" agreement be abrogated, met with a resolute opposition. The Western European states, especially those headed by Socialists and Social-Democrats (the FRG, France, Austria, Greece and some others), objected to such action first of all because it was fraught with unfavourable economic consequences for Western states themselves, and, secondly, because it was bound to further aggravate international tensions and create additional difficulties in maintaining peace and making progress at disarmament talks.

FRG Chancellor Helmut Schmidt declared that the attempts to call the policy of detente in question on the plea of the developments in Poland ran counter to the interests of peace. He resolutely supported the FRG-USSR gas-pipes project.

The US drive to use the attacks on Poland and the Soviet Union to promote America's militarist plans in Europe and throughout the world was not supported by the SI bodies and its major parties. On the contrary, the leaders of the Socialist International and its member parties reiterated their allegiance to the policy of peace, detente, negotiations and peaceful settlement of international disputes.

The loyalty of the Social-Democrats to this policy was proved, among other things, by the February 1982 visit of representatives of the SI Advisory Council on Disarmament to the Soviet Union and their meeting with Leonid Brezhnev.

Talking with the representatives of the Council, Leonid Brezhnev lay special emphasis on the dangerous consequences that the present policies of NATO and, above all, the USA as its chief force, may have for world peace. As for the Soviet Union and its leadership, Leonid Brezhnev stressed, they are firmly convinced that for any state to reckon in its policy on nuclear war and gaining victory in it is sheer madness and an irresponsible, adventurist game jeopardising the destinies of mankind. The NATO decision on deploying US medium-range missiles and Reagan's "zero option", said Brezhnev, are clearly at variance with the principle of equality and equal security. They are aimed at upsetting the present military equilibrium in Europe and on the global scale, to the detriment of the security of the Soviet Union and its allies.

In contradistinction to this course, Leonid Brezhnev said, the Soviet Union is prepared, already at this stage, to negotiate the complete repudiation by both sides, East and West, of all types of medium-range weapons targeted on various points in Europe. "We can go even further," Leonid Brezhnev stressed, "and negotiate complete removal of medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons from Europe. This would really be a 'zero option'."<sup>1</sup> If the West is not yet ready for radical decision, the USSR would agree, for a start, to negotiate a large-scale reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons by both sides. By the year 1990, for instance, it would be possible to reduce the present number of medium-range nuclear weapons three times over and even more by each side.

It would be no less important, Leonid Brezhnev said, to reach an understanding between the USSR and the USA on another crucial issue, that of limiting strategic arms. From time to time the US Administration declares that it is allegedly interested in radical cuts in strategic arms. Yet, in reality Washington does nothing to reach this goal, using various false pretexts even to avoid resuming the talks.

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, February 4, 1982.

Today, said Kalevi Sorsa, head of the SI delegation, the unrestrained escalation of the arms race poses the gravest threat to the whole of mankind. He added that in September 1981 the Bureau of the Socialist International passed a resolution on disarmament proposed by the Advisory Council. In December 1981, the Presidium of the Socialist International called on "all concerned not to use the Polish crisis as a pretext to slow down the efforts for detente and arms control".<sup>1</sup>

Kalevi Sorsa said that the SI Bureau considered the renewal of SALT talks an effective reduction of medium-range nuclear forces in Europe, banning the neutron bomb, convening a conference on disarmament in Europe, establishing nuclear-free zones and limiting the weapons trade to be the most important concrete proposals on practical efforts towards disarmament.

The visit of the representatives of the SI Advisory Council to Moscow testified to the fact that on the whole the Socialist International and its member parties are conscious of the immense danger looming over mankind and regard it as their task to check the further worsening of the international situation and to curb the arms race.

Thus the numerous facts of the early 1980s bear out the fact that the more realistic approach of the SI leaders to the state of world affairs, their concern about the future of the world, and their search for ways to strengthen detente and solve international problems and conflicts arising in various regions of the world by peaceful means are not an accidental, transient stage in the history of the Socialist International, but an important phenomenon determining the development of international social-democracy today.

It would be certainly incorrect to conclude that the Socialist International and its leading parties have completely discarded the anti-Soviet and anti-communist trends typical of the foreign policy perspectives of social-democracy in the past.

Unfortunately today, too, many Social-Democrats are incapable of an unbiased assessment of the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union, tending to regard the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation as potential adversaries. Therefore, they regard "Atlantic solidarity" and the NATO building-up as the basis of the foreign policy course to be pursued by their countries.

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1982, p. 5.

The governments of Western European NATO member countries headed by Social-Democrats generally support, although not without hesitation, the bloc's course towards continuing the arms race. While talking about peace and disarmament, many social-democratic leaders, especially those in the major NATO countries, support the campaign of the ruling circles of the United States and other Western powers to saddle the socialist countries with decisions in the sphere of disarmament that would secure unilateral advantage for Western countries and damage the interests of the socialist states.

Some Social-Democrats try, despite all available evidence, to picture the state of affairs in such a way that it is not the United States and other Western powers, but the Soviet Union, that should be blamed for the continuing arms race. Thus, Helmut Schmidt, speaking in the Bundestag in September 1981, claimed that NATO's decision on deploying new US nuclear missiles in Western Europe was a step forward towards redressing the balance in Eurostrategic armaments which had supposedly been upset by the Soviet Union. He pretended to be unaware of the threat which the US nuclear forward-based missiles targeted at the Soviet Union pose to this country.

François Mitterrand, while recognising that the Soviet Union has no bellicose, aggressive intentions, nonetheless claims that the Soviet Union is seeking military superiority. By so doing, Mitterrand is in fact supporting the intention of the United States to upset the existing balance and is justifying the military measures which are being hastily undertaken by the West.

Some people in the Socialist International, while propagating the idea of an independent social-democratic policy in the international arena, proceed essentially from the "two superpowers" concept and the necessity to consolidate the unity of Western European countries so as to counteract "the hegemony of the two superpowers". In this they place the Soviet Union and the United States on the same footing and ascribe to the Soviet Union the same imperialist ambitions as those inherent in the foreign policy of the US Administration. This distorts the truth about the situation in the world and confuses the masses.

While making declarations on peace and the peaceful solution to all international disputes, the Socialist International at times renders its support to actions by the United States and other

Western countries which do not contribute to the cause of peace but, on the contrary, block the road towards world peace. Some of the prominent Social-Democrats took part in a strident propaganda campaign aimed at instilling in people's minds the idea that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are allegedly opposed to co-operation with Western countries in the area of "free exchange of people and information", that human rights are violated in Poland and the USSR, and the like. In fact they are trying to impose on socialist countries decisions that disregard their legislation and violate their sovereign rights.

The right-wing Socialists and the governments they head continue taking action aimed at weakening co-operation between the socialist countries and the Soviet Union and at putting socialist countries against one another. Lionel Jospin, First Secretary of the French Socialist Party, addressing its April 1980 National Conference, said: "We must also encourage, though without stirring up additional sources of tension, the Eastern European countries in their attempts to alter their relations with the Soviet Union." He even claimed that this was a prerequisite for ensuring detente in Europe.<sup>1</sup>

These negative tendencies in the activity of the Socialist International and its member parties are firmly rooted in many phenomena inherent in capitalist society and in the operation of certain forces within social-democratic ranks. First, anti-Soviet and anti-communist sentiment still runs high among some Social-Democrats, and above of all, their leaders. The years-long tradition of regarding Soviet policy with mistrust and the deep-rooted habit of distorting the nature of the foreign policy actions undertaken by the USSR are still strong.

Secondly, the bourgeoisie, the monopolies and the advocates of the arms race exert a great influence upon the policy pursued by the Social-Democrats. Their pressure is made felt through the mass media and economic and political levers. In countries where Social-Democrats head the governments without having a majority in parliament they are ready to make concessions to their bourgeois partners in the coalition. At times they take decisions and pursue policies which are at variance with the interests of the working people and the fundamental principles of social-democracy.

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 4, 1980, p. 113.

Thirdly, the influence of the US imperialists and their policy upon social-democratic parties and organisations is still strong. Amidst the struggle between the two world systems in the international arena, the continued arms race, instability in some areas of the world, and the existence of acute international problems, certain forces among the Social-Democrats deem it dangerous and even impossible for the countries in Western Europe to abandon their close military and political alliance with the United States and to take an independent foreign policy stand.

Some of the social-democratic leaders acknowledge the strange, unnatural character of the alliance between Western European social-democracy and US imperialism. Lionel Jospin admitted: "The paradox of the international situation, we know, is that the most powerful capitalist country, whose imperial reality is striking and which, as my generation discovered, can be a danger to freedom, is the moving force behind the alliance to which we belong." Nevertheless, he, just as many other Social-Democrats, did not raise the question of breaking with the United States and overcoming the paradox since, in his opinion, this country "contributes effectively—whether we like it or not—to our security".<sup>1</sup>

The economic dependence of Western Europe on American monopolies should also be taken into account. Amidst the growing economic difficulties and exacerbating financial, raw materials and energy crises, certain Western European countries hope to cope with these difficulties with the help of US investment and the financial support on the part of the United States and US-controlled international organisations, including the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

These negative aspects in the activity of the leadership of certain social-democratic parties slow down the process of positive change in the foreign policy of the Socialist International and its member parties.

For the reasons mentioned above, the Socialist International's foreign policy course is still very contradictory and inconsistent, displaying both positive and negative tendencies. It would be wrong to underestimate the harmfulness and danger of the neg-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*

ative aspects in the work of the Socialist International and its member parties, for this can well give rise to ungrounded illusions and misconceptions as regards the nature of the foreign policy actions taken by today's social-democracy.

It would be equally incorrect to ignore the positive changes in the activity of social-democratic parties which further the normalisation of relations among various countries, the renunciation of the positions-of-strength policy and of the arms race, and help the settlement of disputes by peaceful means and the consolidation and broadening of detente.

These positive shifts are not accidental. They are generated by important changes in the alignment of political and class forces in the world, the mounting political awareness of the masses, the development of positive attitudes within social-democracy, the growing number of peace champions in its ranks, and closer co-operation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

In recent years, these tendencies have prevailed in the work of the Socialist International and have determined the most significant steps taken by the SI governing bodies and leaders. For this reason, the International has become a force promoting the development of the anti-war movement and working towards peace and detente. This has enhanced the role and prestige of the Socialist International in the world arena.

There is no doubt that the future of the Socialist International depends, above all, on whether it will remain loyal to the policy of peace, detente and disarmament and translate its declarations in favour of peace and international security into concrete actions by its member parties.

In its message to the 16th Congress of the Socialist International the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union urged "the Socialists and Social-Democrats and the working-class, democratic movement allied with them to increase their contribution to the cause of saving mankind from a nuclear catastrophe, to stir up the popular masses and their organisations to a more vigorous struggle for peace and detente, to enhance the practical effectiveness of their actions on concrete issues of international security and ending the arms race".<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, April 9, 1983.

## Chapter Four

# THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

## 1. The 1950s

An analysis of the Socialist International's positions in the 1950s attests to the fact that although its congresses and conferences adopted a considerable number of declarations and resolutions condemning imperialism and colonialism and recognising the right of colonial nations to independence, the Socialist International did not render any practical assistance to these nations in their hard-fought battle for freedom during the years in question.

Both theoretically and in practice, the leaders of the Socialist International obviously underestimated the importance of the national liberation movement and did not pay sufficient attention to it.

This affected the deliberations of the First Congress of the Socialist International. There were no reports, detailed statements or special decisions devoted to the national liberation movement. The Socialist International programme gave little space to it, formulating only general statements on the problems of colonial and dependent countries.

These general statements were buttressed by neither a concrete analysis of the situation in individual countries of the colonial and dependent world, nor a detailed study of the policies pursued by individual colonial powers, nor effective practical actions to aid the peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is not by chance that a representative of the Socialist Party of India, who for the most part shared the views of the International-

al's leaders, told the Congress that he could not agree with the policy of the Western European social-democrats vis-à-vis the developing countries, as this policy had nothing socialist about it and did not differ from that of a single bourgeois party.

The criticism coming from the representatives of Asian socialist parties was not without effect. The Socialist International set up a Committee to deal with the problems of developed countries and, in November 1951, the SI Bureau held a conference of experts to discuss these problems.

It was important for the SI leaders to draw into the International as many socialist parties and organisations from Asian, African and Latin American countries, as possible which could be instrumental in augmenting the influence of Western European social-democracy in these areas of the world. One will comprehend the dimension of the task if one recalls that in the early days of the International's existence only two Asian and two Latin American countries had their parties represented in its ranks; there was not a single member party in Africa.

The Socialist International's leaders realised that many socialist parties in Asia, Africa and Latin America remaining beyond its framework was one of the main reasons for its weakness. In a memorandum submitted for the consideration of the Second SI Congress in 1962, Morgan Phillips noted that all the parties participating in or co-operating with the Socialist International were comprised of Europeans or persons of European origin, except the Japanese and Indian parties. He stressed that unless vigorous efforts were made to involve new members from the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America the International would remain an organisation of European parties. Morgan Phillips urged the International to recruit the greatest possible number of parties from non-European countries and to render assistance in setting up socialist organisations in countries which did not have them. He insisted that this would broaden the Socialist International's influence in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and help prevent it from turning into a "Western" or "white" organisation.

The European social-democratic leaders took every effort to reach this end. In December 1951, they set up a fund to strengthen relations between the socialist parties in the underdeveloped countries and the Socialist International.

The Second SI Congress held in Milano in October 1952 gave careful consideration to the problems of colonial and dependent countries. The Congress adopted a declaration on socialist policy for the underdeveloped territories which the SI leaders regarded as an indispensable ideological foundation for co-operation with the Asian socialist parties. The Declaration set forth some of the Socialist International's key principles which by and large met the interests of the liberation struggle of the colonial nations and their advance along the road of progress. The trouble is that the document censured colonialism in general terms, without condemning any specific colonial power, or naming the countries enslaved by the imperialists, or explicitly demanding immediate independence for all colonial and dependent nations. Moreover, after having said a few words about "capitalist imperialism", the authors of the Declaration hastily proceeded to portray communism as the main enemy of the oppressed peoples.

Furthermore, while talking about the need to develop the economy and culture and to raise living standards in economically backward countries, the leaders of the Socialist International contended that these problems could be solved in co-operation with the "advanced nations of the free world", that is, with the more developed capitalist countries. It goes without saying that encouraging Asian, African and Latin American countries to co-operate with Western powers alone in effect doomed them to continued dependence on the latter.

However, as subsequent developments were to show, the intention to render assistance to economically underdeveloped countries declared in the SI Programme was never translated into life. In fact, the talk about aid to underdeveloped countries diverted the public's attention from the most pressing problem of the day, that of eliminating the imperialist colonial system and lending support to the colonial peoples in their struggle for political independence.

The liberation forces and movements in the colonial and dependent world were naturally disappointed with the line taken by the Socialist International and its member parties. They openly censured this line, while the Socialists operative in the area refrained from joining the International. This is exemplified, above all, by the actions of the Asian Socialists. Regardless of the

Socialist International's efforts, the socialist parties in Asian countries decided to set up an organisation of their own. For this purpose, in January 1953 they convened the first conference of Asian Socialists. The Socialist International's delegation to the Rangoon Conference, headed by British Labour Party leader Clement Attlee, was instructed to draw as many Asian parties as possible in the International and to make efforts to turn the future association of Asian Socialists into a regional organisation of the International.

The first conference of Asian Socialists, attended by 200 delegates, observers and guests, was a highly representative gathering.

The list of participants included the representatives of:

- the Socialist Party of Japan,
- the Indonesian Socialist Party,
- the Democratic Socialist Party of Japan,
- the Socialist Party of Burma,
- the Socialist Party of Pakistan,
- the Pan-Malayan Labour Party,
- the Socialist Progressive Party of the Lebanon,
- the Indian Praja Socialist Party,
- the Jewish Labour Party of Israel (Mapai),
- the Socialist Party of Egypt.

The representatives of the Tunisian Destour Party, the Nepali Congress, the Uganda National Congress, and the Congress of Peoples against Imperialism had observer status. The delegations of the Socialist International, the International Union of Socialist Youth and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia attended the Conference as guests.

Among the major issues on the Conference agenda was the attitude of the Asian parties to the Socialist International. The representatives of the right-wing Socialists of Japan and Israel suggested that all Asian socialist parties should join the Socialist International and make their association the International's regional organisation. The proposals to this effect were formulated in a special resolution submitted for the consideration of the Conference by the delegation of the Democratic Socialist Party of Japan. However, despite the efforts made by the right-wing Japanese and Israeli Socialists, and notwithstanding the persuasion and pressure on the part of the SI delega-

tion, the socialist parties of Asia refused to join the Socialist International, setting up, instead, an independent organisation, the Asian Socialist Conference (ASC).

Why did the leaders of the socialist parties in Europe and Asia fail to come to an agreement? The fact of the matter is that although they concurred on many issues, there still were some on which they were divided. The foremost point of contention was the attitude to colonialism and the imperialist policy pursued by the Western powers. Aware of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial sentiment in their countries, many Socialists in Asia regarded it inappropriate to join the Socialist International, an organisation which, despite its numerous resolutions and declarations, had done very little to render any meaningful aid to the colonial peoples. Moreover, many Asian Socialists placed little trust in the Western European social-democratic parties because at times they overtly joined hands with the bourgeois parties in effectuating colonialist policies or even initiated actions directed against colonial and dependent nations.

There were serious differences between the leaders of the Socialist International and the Socialists in Asia in the sphere of international relations: the International openly supported NATO and other military alliances formed by the Western powers, whereas the Socialists in Asian countries came out in favour of an independent policy and neutrality for Asian countries.

There were certain differences between the leaders of the Socialist International and the socialist parties in Asia on a number of other questions, including assistance to the developing countries and disarmament.

It would certainly be incorrect to overestimate the importance of the differences between the Socialists in Asia and Europe. There were many issues on which they concurred. This is borne out, for instance, by the policy-making document "Principles and Objectives of Socialism" adopted by the First ASC Congress. On the whole, the Asian Socialists shared the social-reformist positions of the European Socialists. Just as the European Socialists, they adhered to the theory and practice of "democratic socialism".

As for Latin America, the positions of the Socialist International here were even weaker than in Asia. In the early years of the Socialist International's existence the socialist parties of



Argentina and Uruguay were the only Latin American parties to join it. The attempts of the International to recruit other parties from Latin American countries failed.

In this context, the leaders of the Socialist International decided to initiate a Latin American regional organisation of socialist parties to constitute a part of the Socialist International. In so doing the Socialist International intended to prevent the emergence in Latin America of an independent socialist organisation of the ASC type. The first step towards this end was the setting up in 1955 of the Latin American Secretariat of the Socialist International with its headquarters in Montevideo, the capital of Uruguay. The Secretariat was headed by the Uruguayan Socialist Humberto Maiztegui.

On the initiative of the Secretariat, a Consultative Committee of the SI Secretariat was established in 1956. Its membership was initially comprised of the socialist parties of Argentina, Uruguay and Chile. Subsequently, they were joined by the parties of Brazil, Ecuador and Colombia. The Committee's main objective was to develop closer ties among all the socialist parties of Latin America. These efforts, however, failed to boost the Socialist International's membership.

What hampered co-operation between the socialist parties of Latin America and the Socialist International? In the main co-operation was impeded by the same factors that created difficulties in the relations between the Socialists in Europe and those in Asia. Besides, there were serious differences between the European and Latin American Socialists on US policy in the international arena. The Socialist International fully supported the US policies and regarded the United States as its natural and most powerful ally in the struggle against the "communist threat" and in defending the "free world". As for the peoples in Latin America, they viewed the US monopolists as their worst enemies. The domination of US imperialism was the main obstacle to the social and economic development of Latin American countries. The Socialists in Latin America could not ignore this fact, so their attitude towards American imperialism differed significantly from that of the Socialist International.

The Socialist International's positions in Africa were the weakest. At the outset, there was not a single African party among the International's members. Initially, the Socialist International

was not especially concerned about this, and did not make any serious efforts to establish relations and contacts with African Socialists.

However, the rapid process of Africa's liberation from colonial oppression and the emergence of many young African states made the Socialist International and its member parties take a greater interest in Africa and initiate vigorous efforts to win representatives of democratic and national liberation organisations over to their side. The Western European Social-Democrats were apprehensive of these organisations and the newly-free African countries being influenced by socialist countries and communist parties. Therefore, they started to trumpet their support for the African peoples and the organisations working towards national liberation.

The French Socialist Party became especially active in Africa. It made efforts to turn the federations it had earlier established in French colonies into independent parties.

The leadership of the British Labour Party also worked to broaden its influence in Britain's African colonies. They traditionally maintained close ties with many leaders of national liberation organisations, political parties, trade unions, co-operative and other organisations. Taking advantage of these ties, they sought to direct the activity of African politicians and organisations to suit their own ends. The socialist association of British overseas territories they had set up in 1953 was employed for the same purposes.

The leaders of the Jewish Labour Party of Israel (Mapai) were active, and not without success, in Africa. They used to their own advantage the fact that Israel, a close neighbour of African countries, had never had any colonies and was facing problems similar to those confronting the newly-free nations. The Mapai leaders and the government they headed started to organise conferences, seminars and meetings devoted to various problems of concern to the developing countries. They invited representatives of national liberation organisations and the newly-formed governments of African countries to these events.

The SPD of Germany developed its activity in Africa along the same lines. One of its major objectives was to propagate the ideas of "democratic socialism" among the liberation move-

ments in African countries and to assist in training the leading cadres of their political parties and trade unions.

However, all these efforts of Western European Social-Democrats neither helped to increase the membership of the Socialist International by recruiting parties from African countries nor heightened the SI's influence in the African continent to any significant extent.

The SI leaders sought to modify their positions in such a way as to make them more acceptable for the peoples and Socialists in Asia, Africa and Latin America. This is exemplified by the resolution on colonialism adopted by the Third SI Congress held in Stockholm in 1953. However, this resolution, too, reflected the limitedness and inconsistency of the demands advanced by the European Social-Democrats. That is why the General Secretary of the Asian Socialist Conference, Soerjokoesoemo Wijono, summing up the results of the Third Congress, wrote that the European socialist parties gave too much priority to the struggle against communism, while failing to pay any serious attention to the problems of particular concern to the Asian Socialists, such as freedom for the enslaved peoples and a peaceful settlement in Asia.

The May 1954 session of the SI Council held in Vienna was timed to coincide with the Geneva conference of foreign ministers on the problems of Asia and the Far East. The session considered the same questions as those on the agenda of the Geneva Conference. The leaders of European social-democratic parties could have taken this opportunity to chart a truly socialist programme of support for the liberation struggle waged by the peoples in Indochina, Korea and other Asian countries. But they did not. The *News Chronicle*, a British bourgeois paper, noted on May 10, 1954 that the crisis in Indochina and the Far East proved to be too difficult a matter for the leaders of the Socialist International. Indeed, the Conference failed to map out efforts towards solving these problems.

On the whole, the Socialist International came out in favour of Western powers' policy vis-à-vis Asia, in particular their plans to set up the SEATO bloc. Conscious of the unpopularity of the SEATO idea with the Asian nations, Morgan Phillips recommended that the leadership of the United States, Great Britain and other countries should prompt the Asian states them-

selves to initiate the establishment of this military alliance.

The SI leaders' overt support of an imperialist alliance provoked the displeasure of Social-Democrats in Asian countries, who, cognizant of the negative attitude of their peoples to SEATO, came out against it. According to Secretary of the Indian Praja Socialist Party Madhu Limaye, SEATO was bound to foster the split in Asia instead of promoting its unification. This bloc, he stressed, would perpetuate Western interference in Asian affairs, rather than serve as an instrument of doing away with it.

In a bid to get the Socialists and peoples of Asia to overcome their mistrust of the Socialist International and its policy, the leaders of the International, assisted by the leaders of the Asian Socialist Conference, prepared a new statement on the colonial question which was endorsed by the Fourth SI Congress held in June 1955.

However, this statement, like many previous SI declarations, was highly general. It is not by chance that the representatives of Asian Socialists speaking at the Congress urged the European Social-Democrats to give more heed to the problems of colonialism and the national liberation movement.

As the outcome of the congress and the subsequent events showed, the adoption of a "joint statement" did not alter the Socialist International's policy towards the liberation struggle of the Asian and African peoples. Moreover, the 1956 developments in the Middle East emphasised the glaring contradiction between the International's general declarations and its concrete actions.

It is common knowledge that early 1956 was marked by growing Middle East tensions generated by the imperialist policy of the Western powers, above all Britain, France and Israel, vis-à-vis Egypt and the latter's efforts to defend its rights and interests. What was needed was a resolute condemnation of the imperialists, accompanied by active measures to prevent their aggression on the part of all peace-loving and anti-imperialist forces. However, the resolutions adopted by the SI Bureau in January 1956 and by the SI Council Conference later in March, instead of denouncing the actions of Western powers, justified them and blamed Egypt for the tense situation and alleged preparations for an attack on Israel.

The position of the Socialist International did not restrain,

but, on the contrary, encouraged the anti-Egyptian policy of the ruling circles in Britain, France and Israel. After Egypt had nationalised the Suez Canal Company, the imperialist leaders, first of all those in Britain and France, switched from the policy of threats to preparations for a direct aggression. In fact, the European social-democratic leaders proved to be aligned with the colonialists. They described Egypt's actions as "an illegal step", "an act of violence", "a violation of international law", etc. They insisted on undertaking "appropriate" measures to restore the "legitimate rights" of the former owners of the Suez Canal.

In those days the Socialist International did nothing to prevent the aggression against Egypt. It is important to note that in France and Israel, two out of the three countries that instigated the aggression, the governments were headed by the leaders of socialist parties enjoying authority in the Socialist International.

The whole world was outraged by the imperialist act of aggression. A large-scale protest campaign was launched throughout the world. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries resolutely took the side of Egypt. Even the United Nations, which in those days did not normally oppose any actions taken by imperialist states, condemned the aggressors. The Socialist International, however, remained passive.

Its position as regards the colonial war waged by the French imperialists in Algeria was no less unseemly. The French leaders flatly refused to satisfy the Algerian people's rightful demand for independence. They unleashed a bloody war against the Algerian people who, on November 1, 1954, rose up in arms to liberate their country. The whole of progressive humanity protested against the criminal action of the French colonialists.

What was the position of the Socialist International and its member parties on this issue? At first, the International avoided discussing the situation in Algeria, and watched impassively the French imperialists wage a war of extermination. In January 1956 leaders of the Socialist Party came to head the French government. Guy Mollet, Vice-President of the International, became Prime-Minister of France. However, the reshuffle of the French government had not the slightest effect on France's policy in Algeria, and the colonial war went on. This caused indignation and protest on the part of the progres-

sive forces throughout the world. Many Social-Democrats denounced the policy pursued by the French Socialist Party.

The Socialists of Asia, at their conference convened in Bombay in October 1956, adopted a special resolution expressing sympathy with the Algerian people and denouncing the policy of the French Socialists as incompatible with the "socialist ideals".

No longer able to avoid discussing the Algerian issue, the Socialist International was forced to include it on the agenda of its Fifth Congress held in Vienna in 1957. The Norwegian Social-Democrat Finn Moe, who delivered a report on this item of the agenda, the Swedish delegate Kaj Björk and some other speakers condemned the position taken by the French Socialist Party. The French socialist leaders were patently displeased with this reaction and considered the accusations brought against them to be unfair. Pierre Commin, addressing the Congress, declared unequivocally that the French Socialist Party had no intention of granting independence to Algeria and tried to justify this position theoretically. He said: "We Socialists refuse to believe that the phase of nationalism is a means of bringing about the liberation of man. On the contrary, it is the duty of Socialists to help to avoid that dangerous phase and, instead, to advance towards a higher form of co-operation between colonial and metropolitan peoples... We should fail in our mission if we simply allowed nationalism to run its course instead of trying to direct developments in accordance with our Socialist doctrine."<sup>1</sup> Thus, by referring to the socialist doctrine, the French socialist leaders tried to justify their support for the colonialist policy of the French imperialists.

The year 1958 witnessed the further deterioration of the Middle East situation. It was brought about by the aggressive policy pursued by the imperialist powers in a bid to strangle the growing movement of the Arab peoples for their independence and freedom. The military coup in Iraq, which eliminated the pro-imperialist regime of Nuri Said and the corrupt monarchical system, served as a plea for the renewed onslaught of the colonial powers. The collapse of the Nuri Said regime seriously undermined the positions of Western powers throughout the

<sup>1</sup> *SH*, No. 35, 1957, p. 607.

Middle East. It led to the virtual dissolution of the Baghdad Pact (whose headquarters was located in Baghdad), and imparted a new impetus to the national liberation movement in Arab countries.

In this context, the British and American imperialists attempted to overthrow the new Iraqi government by force of arms so as to consolidate their position. Preparing to attack Baghdad, they brought their troops to Jordan and Lebanon. However, the colonialists' plan was frustrated. An enormous role here, just as in the case of the Suez crisis, was played by the Soviet Union, which resolutely defended the independence of Arab countries.

What was the International's reaction to these developments?

It kept silent. It did not deem it necessary to discuss the issue at the sessions of its various bodies. Neither did it consider it imperative to disclose its position. This is understandable: cognizant of the response to the aggression throughout the world, and especially in Asia and Africa, the International was not in a position to openly approve of the venture undertaken by the US and British imperialists. At the same time, it did not wish to oppose the policy of the US and British ruling circles and so, while regarding their methods as not quite in tune with the situation, supported the general foreign policy course pursued by the Western powers.

The souring of the international situation, fraught with serious consequences to peace, stirred the serious concern of many Social-Democrats. They remembered the days of the Suez crisis and realised the danger of remaining passive under similar conditions. The social-democratic leaders could no longer ignore the sentiment of the rank-and-file members of their parties. Even Giuseppe Saragat, who had initially justified the American intervention in Lebanon, was compelled to make serious reservations, insisting that the Italian government should embark on a different foreign policy course. The British Laborites, too, criticised the aggression in Lebanon and Jordan. The Norwegian Social-Democratic Party urged the governments of the USSR, the USA, Great Britain and France as well as the United Nations Secretary General, to help achieve peaceful settlement in the Middle East. The leaders of the Socialist Party of Japan demanded that British and US troops be immediately withdrawn

from the Middle East countries and the new Iraqi government be granted recognition.

The success of the national liberation movement and the defeats suffered by the colonial powers made it imperative for the SI leaders to make certain adjustments in their policy vis-à-vis the national liberation movement. Efforts to alter this policy were made at the Sixth SI Congress held in 1959 which discussed, among other things, the situation in the Middle East and the problem of aid to underdeveloped countries.

However, as the results of the Sixth Congress indicated, the SI leadership failed to work out a clearcut anti-imperialist stand. The delegation of the Socialist Party of Uruguay proposed that the Congress consider a resolution to denounce the French Socialist Party's colonial policy in Algeria as running counter to the principles of independence and the right of nations to self-determination, to condemn the pro-colonialist tendencies in the policies pursued by the Israeli Mapai Party, the Belgian Socialist Party, and the Dutch Labour Party, and to expel the French Socialist Party from the Socialist International. Since the International's leaders refused to discuss the resolution, the Socialist Party of Uruguay withdrew from the Socialist International.

Never before had the leaders of the International and its Western European members heard such severe criticism from their recent colleagues in the International, and from a party which the head of the Latin American Secretariat of the Socialist International, Humberto Maiztegui, had described as the strongest and most influential socialist party in Latin America.

The withdrawal of the Socialist Party of Uruguay from the Socialist International and its sharp criticism of the European social-democratic parties' stand placed the SI leaders in a difficult position. The Socialist Party of Uruguay was in fact the only party in Latin America to have taken a more or less active part in the work of the International. The Socialists of Uruguay had supported the Latin American Consultative Committee of the SI Secretariat. The Uruguayan Socialists' withdrawal from the International seriously undermined its positions not only in Latin America but in Asia and Africa as well.

Thus, an analysis of the position taken by the Socialist International in the 1950s shows that, having associated itself with

the policy pursued by the Western powers, the Socialist International took a stand on the struggle waged by the colonial and dependent peoples that was in conflict with its own declarations denouncing imperialism and colonialism. Admittedly, there were many people in social-democratic parties, first of all in the countries which had no colonies (the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, Austria and others), who sympathised with oppressed peoples and sought to help them. But it was not these people who determined the position of the Socialist International.

The growth of the liberation movement in colonial and dependent countries and the increasing influence of the Soviet Union and Communists in these regions were viewed by the SI leaders as a threat to the Western world. For this reason, the Socialist International was concerned not so much with rendering aid to the peoples in colonial countries striving for independence as with retaining them in the sphere of influence of the Western powers. This posture prevented the Socialist International from gaining the confidence of the socialist and democratic organisations in Asia, Africa and Latin America and isolated it from the powerful forces of national liberation movement.

## 2. The 1960s

The early 1960s signalled a new stage in the development of the liberation struggle waged by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. By this time more than 40 colonial countries had gained independence. The positions of world imperialism and especially those of the former metropolitan countries were seriously weakened. New horizons of social development opened up before the emergent nations.

However, the attainment of political independence signified the end of the first stage in the national liberation revolution and not the revolution itself. The struggle for complete independence from imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America went on. The imperialists sought to retain their positions in these areas, to direct the development of the newly-free countries to suit their own ends, and to keep them within the world capitalist system by using various neo-colonialist methods. The problems confronting the emergent nations could be resolved

only by consolidating national independence, eliminating the domination of imperialist powers over the economies of these countries, effecting far-reaching social and economic reforms, establishing true democracy and changing the entire life-style of the peoples which had embarked upon the road of non-capitalist development.

The Socialist International could not ignore the situation which had emerged in the zone of the national liberation movement. The European social-democratic leaders came to recognise the important role of Asian, African and Latin American countries on the world scene. They made considerable efforts to adjust their policy to the new world situation, render it more acceptable for the emergent states, gain the confidence of the latter, and win over to their side the socialist and national liberation parties and movements.

The social-democratic leaders charted the policy of the Socialist International vis-à-vis the newly-free countries at various meetings and conferences. The Standing Subcommittee of the Bureau set up in February 1960 was put in charge of these problems.

The International's leadership expected much from the Conference of the SI Council held in Haifa, Israel, in April 1960. Significantly, it was the first SI Conference to be convened outside Europe. By making this gesture the European Social-Democrats intended to illustrate their desire to come closer to the countries of Asia and Africa and to devote more attention to their problems. The choice of the time and venue was also determined by the fact that in 1960 a large group of African colonies had become independent. The SI leaders intended to take advantage of the Haifa Conference to establish closer contacts with the leaders of the newly-free states and the political parties and movements there.

The main objective of the Conference consisted in working out a policy vis-à-vis Asian and African countries. This problem was touched upon in the memoranda submitted by the British Labour Party and the Belgian Socialist Party, in the major reports and in the interventions of the delegates. For the first time in the history of the Socialist International the main reports were made by a representative of the Asian Socialist Conference as well as a representative of the International.

The discussions resulted in a statement on the new tasks of "democratic socialism". This document had been conceived as a detailed programme for the national, economic and social emancipation of the peoples of the colonial world. However, its authors, the SI leaders, failed to cope with the task. All that the SI leaders had to offer the representatives of the emergent nations boiled down to a proposal to hold conferences and seminars to exchange experience, ideas and publications with the socialist parties in their countries, to convene conferences on the problems of economic co-operation, and the like.

The results of the Conference disappointed the representatives of the developing countries. Western Socialists, they contended, made little effort to study the problems facing the newly-free countries and to elaborate a programme which could be instrumental in overcoming backwardness and poverty. Some of the speakers pointed out that the Communists had made much greater progress both in theory and practice; therefore, communism was more attractive to the developing nations. Assessing the policy of the Socialist International in the past period, the Socialist Party of Japan pointed out in a statement adopted at its March 1961 Congress: "Japanese Socialists regret that the Socialist International is unable to free itself entirely from its 'Western Europe first' attitude, and that it is therefore unable to play a positive role in the advancement of the cause of peace and the emancipation of the dependent peoples."<sup>1</sup>

The leaders of the Socialist International were aware of the weakness of their positions in Asia, Africa and Latin America and realised the need for measures to end their isolation from the liberation forces on these continents. They attempted to solve this problem while preparing and holding the Seventh SI Congress (Rome, October 1961). Judging from the results of the Congress, however, they again failed to enhance their influence in the developing countries to a considerable extent. The Congress was held under the highly pretentious slogan, "The New Countries and the New Generation for Socialism". The Congress had been conceived as the turning point in the relations between the European Social-Democrats and the peoples in the developing countries. According to *The Times*, the aim of the SI leaders was

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 19, 1961, p. 391.

to make a fresh attempt to spread the influence of the ideology and policy of social-democracy in Asia, Africa and Latin America and to prevent the political parties and the emergent states from being controlled by the Communists.<sup>1</sup> Opening the Seventh Congress, Giuseppe Saragat struck the same keynote: "The eight hundred million people who, in the course of the last few years, have emerged from colonial status and reached autonomy will bring a decisive influence to bear on the future evolution of mankind. Will they allow themselves to be seduced by the mirage of Communism, or will they rally to the flag of democratic Socialism? This is the decisive question. To integrate the political forces of Social Democracy in the more developed countries and those forces that give progressive leadership to the masses in Asia and Africa may indeed prove to be our most important task."<sup>2</sup> This idea also underlay the draft declaration "The World Today—the Socialist Perspectives", and the discussion on the problem "Co-operation Between Developing and Developed Countries".

This was the first congress to be attended by representatives of African organisations in Nigeria, Tanganyika, Senegal, Madagascar and Cameroon. The Socialist Party of Cameroon and the Social-Democratic Party of Madagascar joined the Socialist International. The SI leaders did not stint protestations of sympathy with the emergent nations. They recognised the important role of the developing countries in the international arena, appreciated the difficulties facing them, talked about the importance of rendering them all-round aid, etc. In point of fact, however, they were concerned with keeping the newly-free countries in the sphere of influence of the Western powers and preventing them from co-operation with the socialist countries. That is why both in the declaration and in their speeches they sought to defend and justify the policy pursued by the Western powers,

<sup>1</sup> See: *The Times*, October 4, 1961, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 44-45, 1961, p. 669. Similar tasks were formulated by other participants in the Congress. Thus, the Danish Social-Democrat Torsten Nilson told the Congress: "There is a great ideological battle going on in the world today... We want our brand of democracy and Socialism to gain ground. We want the ideas of the Socialist International to become universal." (*SI*, No. 22-23, 1962, p. 332.)



on the one hand, and, to denigrate the socialist countries and communist parties, on the other hand. Thus, Hugh Gaitskell, while declaring that the Socialists on principle believed that it was imperative to help poorer nations and sought to do away, as soon as possible, with the vestiges of colonialism, noted that Socialists were confronted with "the challenge of Communism" and that it was vital to "defeat this challenge".<sup>1</sup>

The Congress in Rome was highlighted by the fact that the leaders of the Socialist International confined the debate to the problems of aid to be rendered to the young Asian and African states, ignoring the problems of many nations in their struggle for national independence, and the question of neo-colonialism.

It is understandable that such a position could not but disillusion the representatives of Asian and African countries and provoke their objections. The delegate of the Indian Praja Socialist Party said, for instance, that while focusing on the emergent nations' development problems, one should not forget that many millions of people in 79 countries and other territories still suffered from foreign domination. Dom Mintoff, leader of the Labour Party of Malta, pointed out that there was strong mistrust as regards the motives and sincerity of the Western approach to the newly-free Asian and African countries and even more so to the countries where colonialism still persisted. "The sincerity of the Western countries is to be gauged," he said, "not by what they say about Russia, but by what they do in those countries where they have the power to put their ideals into practice."<sup>2</sup>

Since the new draft declaration submitted for the consideration of the Seventh SI Congress reflected the viewpoint of the right-wing European social-democratic leaders without giving an answer to the questions of concern to the peoples in developing countries, it was rejected by the Socialists of Asia and Africa. This certainly could not but worry the SI leaders and member parties. Many prominent Social-Democrats recognised the need for altering the Socialist International's positions vis-à-vis the developing countries.

In early 1962 the Socialist International dispatched a mission,

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 16-17, 1962, pp. 238-40.

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 16-17, 1962, p. 254.

consisting of two groups, to study the state of affairs on the African continent. One group visited the French-speaking countries and the other the English-speaking ones. The Socialist International's representatives visited many countries and met many politicians and leaders of national democratic organisations and movements. They actively propagated the ideas of "democratic socialism" and explored the possibilities for involving various groups and parties in the Socialist International.

After the trip, the members of the group submitted their conclusions to the leaders of the Socialist International. Their recommendations were approved by the session of the SI Council held in Oslo in June 1962. The recommendations included publishing and circulating in France's former African colonies a French version of the International's Bulletin; forming a special department of the SI Secretariat to follow developments in Africa and maintain contacts with African parties and political figures; sending special groups to African countries to promote the ideas of "democratic socialism"; and setting up a "Socialist Peace Corps" to send experts to work in African countries.

The Socialist International dispatched a similar mission to Latin America where, by the beginning of the 1960s, the prestige of Western European social-democracy had diminished considerably. The fact of the matter is that the victory of the Cuban revolution promoted anti-imperialist and anti-American sentiment among the social-democratic parties and organisations and led to the virtual rupture of their contacts with the Socialist International. In this context, the SI leaders started to explore ways of establishing contacts and cooperation with the popular parties in Latin America which, while not being social-democratic organisations proper, shared quite a few of the social-democratic views on various problems of international relations and domestic policies. Some of these parties enjoyed considerable influence among the masses in Venezuela, Peru and other countries. Therefore, the leaders of the Socialist International expected to overcome the difficulties they were experiencing in Latin America and considerably heighten their authority through developing ties with these parties.

Summing up the results of the trip to Latin America, Secretary of the International Albert Carthy pointed out that the popular parties "felt a bond of common interest and aspiration

with many Member Parties of the Socialist International, and desired to develop contacts with it".<sup>1</sup>

The results of the Rome Congress, the extensive discussion of the above-mentioned problems in social-democratic parties, and the recommendations worked out by the groups which had visited Africa and Latin America impelled the leaders of the Socialist International to modify their positions. This was reflected in the declaration "The World Today—the Socialist Perspective" adopted at the SI Council's conference in Oslo in 1962.

Unlike the 1951 programme in which the problems related to the national liberation movement were in effect passed over in silence, the 1962 policy-making declaration gave them much space. The declaration "Socialism and Emergent Nations" contains a whole section devoted to them. The Chairman of the Programme Commission, J. G. Suurhoff, commented that it was "the centre of gravity of the whole document".<sup>2</sup>

The Socialist International reiterated its recognition of the right of all nations to self-determination, acclaimed the successes scored by the peoples in the colonial and dependent countries in their struggle for independence, pointed to the enormous difficulties facing the emergent nations and stressed the necessity for the developed states to render aid to the newly-free countries. The declaration states that "the Socialist International finds no moral justification for the continued existence of colonialism and condemns it in all its forms".<sup>3</sup>

The Declaration recommended that the industrialised countries should annually allocate not less than one per cent of their national income in aid to the developing countries.

It should be borne in mind that when including such statements in the SI programme the leaders of the Socialist International realised that there existed a wide gap between the declaration and the implementation of the principles proclaimed in it. Remarkable in this respect was the comment by J. G. Suurhoff. For certain Western European countries, he said, rendering aid to the emergent nations was, in a sense, tantamount to paying out a debt of honour to the former colonised nations. "Now it

is not difficult to formulate these thoughts and write them down," Suurhoff wrote. "However, our International will have to realise that the accomplishment of the task which it is holding up to the world, will require a complete change of mind and heart, and a complete change in the behaviour of hundreds of millions of people, both in the industrially advanced and in the emergent countries".<sup>1</sup>

There is at the present juncture no evidence, however, that the social-democratic leaders have done much to pay out the debt of honour mentioned at the SI Council Conference as early as 1962.

Along with certain positive statements based on an understanding of the demands and interests of the newly-free countries, the new SI document contained quite a few formulas which distorted the actual state of affairs and failed to meet the vital interests of the young states.

The social-democratic ideologists misinterpreted the nature of imperialist domination in colonial and dependent countries. They tended to describe it as the purely political sway of the metropolitan countries over the colonies. Therefore, the attainment of political independence by the colonial countries was made synonymous with the elimination of imperialist colonialist policy in general, the problem of the neo-colonialist economic domination over the emergent countries was passed over in silence, and the relationship between the major capitalist and developing countries was portrayed in a distorted light.

The SI leaders were clearly biased in interpreting the causes of the economic, social and cultural backwardness of Asian, African and Latin American countries, reducing them to such factors as general historical backwardness, high birth rates and the like. They were unwilling to recognise the historical truth: the blame for the disastrous situation in many young states should be put, above all, on the imperialists who continue to profit from exploiting these states through neo-colonialist methods.

The new SI Declaration contained various recommendations on what the newly-free countries should do to eliminate their backwardness. In the main, these recommendations and good wishes boiled down to various programmes for modernising the

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 34-35, 1963, p. 482.

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 26, 1962, p. 379.

<sup>3</sup> *SI*, No. 24-25, 1962, p. 354.

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 26, 1962, p. 380.

economy within the framework of the existing social and economic relations, and overlooked the need for effecting far-reaching social and economic transformations. Such problems as nationalising foreign property and developing the state sector were ignored.

As to aid to the emergent nations the Socialist International's leaders proceeded not so much from the interests of the developing countries as from those of major capitalist states. Aid was regarded as an important means of strengthening the positions of "Western democracy" in developing countries and an instrument to prevent the proliferation of communist ideas. Addressing the Oslo Conference, Robert Pontillon, International Secretary of the French Socialist Party, pointed out that the West had proved to be incapable of abandoning outdated methods, adjusting itself to the new world situation and avoiding "the basic contradiction between the concept of domination and that of co-operation". He stressed that if the Western countries persisted in this attitude the emergent nations would be inspired by the Soviet example.<sup>1</sup>

The social-democratic leaders pushed the emergent nations towards all-round co-operation with the Western powers and sought to hamper the development of their relations with the socialist countries, above all with the Soviet Union. They claimed that co-operation with the USSR and the other countries of socialist community imperils the independence of the newly-free nations.

The Socialist International's leaders advanced a thesis on the possibility and necessity for the newly-free countries to embark upon a "special road" differing from both capitalism and existing socialism. This thesis was counterposed to the communist thesis on the non-capitalist way of development leading to socialism. "These new States," the Declaration says, "have the opportunity of escaping the evils of Capitalism and Communism alike. . . . The future belongs no more to Communism than to Capitalism."<sup>2</sup>

What is meant by the "special road" different from both capitalism and communism? What the International's ideologists had in mind was again "democratic socialism". "Democratic so-

cialism", they claimed, could resolve all the problems facing the newly-free countries and open up for them the way to the society of abundance, equality, fraternity and freedom. In advocating the ideas of "democratic socialism", the International's leaders proceeded from the premise that there existed suitable conditions for their gaining currency among the members of various parties and organisations in the developing countries, as well as among the public figures there who were carried away with different ideas of "national socialism". The European social-democratic leaders sought to take advantage of these erroneous, petty-bourgeois, utopian, non-scientific views in propagating their doctrine and spreading their influence.

To sum up, the 1962 policy-making declaration of the Socialist International reflected various and at times conflicting views. On the one hand, mindful of the new situation in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and seeking to overcome its own isolation in these regions of the world, the Socialist International incorporated in its policy-making declaration a number of provisions mirroring, to an extent, the demands of democratic and liberation forces operative on these continents. On the other hand, the recommendations and counsel the International gave to the developing countries hampered the attainment of their goals and helped to retain these countries within the sphere of influence of Western powers and within the confines of the world capitalist system.

The contradictory nature and ambiguity of the SI positions did not satisfy many of the socialist and democratic organisations in the developing countries. For this reason, the Socialist International's efforts notwithstanding, in the early 1960s it was still, in effect, an organisation of Western European parties. Only seven out of 40 SI member parties represented Asian, African and Latin American countries.

This naturally worried the International's leadership. A spirited debate on the reasons for this and on the ways of turning the International into a truly global organisation of international social-democracy was launched in the bodies and parties of the Socialist International.

Not only individual Social-Democrats but also some socialist parties started to criticise the activity of the International and make proposals on changing its policy and structure. In June

<sup>1</sup> See: *SI*, No. 38-39, 1962, p. 572.

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 24-25, 1962, p. 357.

1963, the Austrian Socialist Party adopted a special resolution urging "organisational changes in the structure of the Socialist International" aimed at rendering it politically more effective. The resolution recommended: "Points to be examined particularly are whether, apart from full membership, there should be associated and consultant members in the International and whether the formation of regional federations of Socialist parties should be aimed at the Socialist International itself assuming the character of a Democratic Socialist World Alliance".<sup>1</sup>

The proposals of the Austrian Socialist Party, initiated, among others, by Bruno Pittermann, Chairman of the Socialist International, were discussed at the sessions of the Bureau and at the Eighth SI Congress held in Amsterdam in autumn 1963.

These discussions led to important changes in the SI statutes. The status of an associated and a consultant member was introduced in addition to full membership opening the doors of the Socialist International to those numerous socialist and democratic organisations in Asia, Africa and Latin America which did not want to become full members of the Socialist International responsible for its decisions and actions, but were not averse to co-operating with it.

At the same time, the decision on the status of an associated and a consultant member provided the Socialist International with better possibilities for maintaining contacts and co-operation with many democratic parties and organisations which, not being social-democratic per se, were close to the SI member parties politically.

Apart from these changes, the Amsterdam Congress mapped out a number of other measures calculated to invigorate the activity of the Socialist International; the setting up of regional associations of social-democratic parties within the framework of a "world international" in order to promote more frequent and regular political consultations and co-ordinate the policies and actions of the member parties; putting out a larger number of publications in various languages; establishing standing committees on different questions; and setting up a research bureau of the Socialist International.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 25, 1963, p. 371.

<sup>2</sup> See: *SI*, No. 39-40, 1963, p. 531.

Commenting on the importance of these steps, Karl Czernetz wrote: "We came to Amsterdam with the brave idea of making our Socialist influence felt more strongly in international politics... What we want is to help solve the great social problems of our unprecedented revolutionary age." In reality, the "socialist" policy of the Socialist International was aimed at spreading the influence of social reformism in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The same objectives were served by other decisions of the Eighth SI Congress, specifically, by its resolution on the developing countries. It expressed concern over the widening gap between the wealthy and the poor nations. The Congress reiterated an earlier SI proposal that the developed countries should channel not less than one per cent of their national income in aid to the developing countries, stipulating that this aid should be rendered solely through the services of the United Nations.

The Congress came out in favour of the following measures:

"1. Removal of trade barriers for export products of developing countries. . .

"2. Conclusion of world-wide commodity agreements to stabilise prices of primary products.

"3. Formation of a U. N. Development Insurance Fund, which could help to protect developing countries against possible future losses which they might suffer as a result of falling prices of their export products.

"4. Aid to developing countries to reduce their excessive dependence on one or two export products and to diversify their economy."<sup>2</sup>

The above-listed measures on the whole accorded with the interests of the developing countries. The Eighth SI Congress also adopted a resolution on colonialism, condemning all governments that still oppressed colonial nations, and expressing sympathy and solidarity with the nations fighting for independence. The trouble with these, as well as with many other SI resolutions, was that Western governments, even those headed by Social-Democrats, did not follow the recommendations and proposals of the Socialist International. As for the Socialist Inter-

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 49, 1963, p. 720.

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 39-40, 1963, pp. 575-76.

national, it had neither the authority nor desire to insist that its member parties implement its programmes and proposals.

Following the decisions adopted at the Eighth Congress, the SI Bureau decided to stimulate the activity of the SI Latin American Secretariat and to resume publishing its bulletin as a measure to strengthen the ties between the popular parties in Latin America and the Socialist International. In March 1964, Albert Carthy attended a meeting of the representatives of the popular parties held in Venezuela and had talks with them on concrete forms of co-operation between their parties and the Socialist International.

The Ninth special Congress of the SI convened in September 1964 in Brussels for the Centenary of the First International also focused on the SI policy vis-à-vis the national liberation movements. In response to the criticism levelled by the representatives of national liberation organisations, the SI leaders declared that it was necessary for European social-democracy to adopt a new approach to the problems of young states and to create conditions facilitating the removal of the barriers which separated it from the liberation movements. The leader of the Belgian Socialists, Léo Collard, pointed out in his opening address to the Congress: "It is neither in Europe nor in the United States, neither in the U.S.S.R. nor in the Communist China, that the world's future will be decided, but in what is called the Third World; in Africa, in Asia and in Latin America." The leaders of the Socialist International, he said, would have to deal with various forms of socialism, each with its own specifics. He concluded: "It is to this very complex problem of pluralism . . . that the International has to try and find an answer."<sup>1</sup>

In the years that followed the social-democratic parties made efforts to adapt their policies to the new conditions. These efforts were discussed at numerous conferences, simposia, member-party and SI congresses. In order to elaborate a uniform policy for the Social-Democrats, an SI Committee on Developing Areas was established.

The social-democratic leaders pinned great hopes on the Tenth SI Congress held in Stockholm in May 1966. The Congress was expected to usher in a new stage in relations between the social-

democratic parties and the developing countries. It was thoroughly prepared for. The preparatory work was discussed by the SI Bureau as early as February and April 1965 and by the leaders of West European social-democratic parties at their conference held long before the Congress. Special emphasis was laid on involving as many representatives of developing countries as possible in the Congress's deliberations.

The Congress was preceded by a Conference held in Uppsala and devoted to the problems of Asian, African and Latin American countries. Apart from the delegates from European socialist parties, the Conference was attended by the representatives of democratic and national liberation organisations in developing countries. A closed session discussed the setting up of an organisation of social-democratic parties of Asia and Oceania. The representatives of Latin American parties at their special gathering decided to broaden co-operation between the Latin American Secretariat of the Socialist International and the Coordinating Committee of the Popular Parties and to reserve a seat in this Committee for the leader of the Secretariat.

The problems of aid to the developing countries were also given careful consideration. The resolution adopted on this issue, in effect, reiterated the statements made at previous congresses.

This was the first time that an SI congress discussed in great detail the problems concerning Latin American countries. The debates resulted in a Declaration on Latin America replete with wishes for success and prosperity for Latin American peoples. The leaders of social-democracy voiced their belief that "the national revolutionary and popular parties and democratic Socialism constitute the sole political force capable of satisfactorily overcoming the historical difficulties of Latin America".<sup>2</sup>

The results of the Tenth Congress testified to the aspiration of the social-democratic leaders to adjust the structure, forms and methods of SI activities so as to promote the International's co-operation with various parties and organisations in developing countries, including those which ideologically were to the right of social-democracy. This marked the appearance of a new aspect in the activity of the Socialist International.

However, in the 1960s, despite their protestations of solidarity

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 20-21, 1964, p. 227.

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 9-10, 1966, p. 112.

with the peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America, their calls for assistance to them, and their desire to develop contacts and co-operation with their parties and organisations, the leaders of the Socialist International failed to consolidate their positions on these continents and to recruit many parties and organisations in the developing countries.

What were the reasons behind the setbacks suffered by the Socialist International in the 1960s? First of all, among the more serious obstacles hampering the broadening of the International's influence in Asia, Africa and Latin America were differences in the ideological and political concepts advocated by the European Social-Democrats and the progressive, democratic forces in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The "democratic socialism" advertised by the International's ideologists did not satisfy the essential requirements of the emergent nations, because it was unable to map out radical political, social and economic reforms that could actually promote non-capitalist development. That is why those people in the emergent countries who sincerely sought to do away with the ills of capitalism were mistrustful of European Social-Democrats and their International.

This mistrust was promoted by the fact that the SI leaders, while urging the young states to embark on the road of "democratic socialism", failed to establish it in their own countries, although many of them had repeatedly and for a long time held government offices and had therefore had an opportunity to translate their theory into practice. The Socialists and Democrats in the developing countries had nothing to learn from the Western European Social-Democrats in terms of experience in effecting revolutionary transformations and waging a real struggle for socialism.

Moreover, there were formidable differences between the Western European Social-Democrats and the progressive organisations and leaders of the developing countries on international affairs. While proclaiming their solidarity with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America fighting for their freedom and independence, the leaders of the Socialist International continued to cling to the policy of "Atlantic solidarity", and vigorously supported the international activity of the United States and other Western powers that ran counter to the interests of

the developing countries. It is only natural that such a posture was opposed by the democratic organisations and leaders in the newly-free states. They expected the Socialist International to be more vigorous and effective in the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism, and to pursue a foreign policy less influenced by that of the United States and NATO.

Many progressive public figures in the newly-free countries could not accept the bellicose anti-communism and anti-Sovietism typical of the Socialist International's activity of the period. Those parties and leaders in the emergent states who accepted the notion of non-capitalist development as formulated by the Communists, and who believed that scientific socialism was the only theory serving their interests, could not but be mistrustful of the International's activity and the "third road" concept.

It is noteworthy that while talking about being well-disposed towards the newly-free nations and their leaders and parties, the SI leadership were in fact often unfriendly towards them. This is borne out, for instance, by the discussion on "African Socialism" launched by the Socialist International's journal in 1964. It published a number of articles whose authors, proceeding from the social-democratic concept of democracy, particularly from the idea of the multi-party system, regarded all those African regimes which were based on a one-party system as undemocratic. According to Robert Rauscher, one of the SPD ideologists, the views of the African leaders on democracy were "in total conflict with the political principles of the Socialist International and its affiliated 'member parties'" and consequently there was no "common basis" for co-operation with the policy-makers in the emergent African states since their views differed from those of the Socialist International.<sup>1</sup>

An incident that occurred at the Tenth SI Congress was typical of the behaviour of the leaders of European social-democracy. On the insistence of a number of parties and, above all, of the Social-Democratic Party of Sweden, the Congress was attended by the representatives of some liberation parties and movements in Africa. When they expressed a desire to address the Congress, they were not given the floor owing, primarily, to the ob-

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 10, 1964, p. 115.



jections on the part of the British Labour Party leaders who were afraid that their policy in Africa and especially in South Rhodesia would be criticised. This sparked an outburst of indignation on the part of African delegates and evoked their criticism of the positions of the Labourites and the Socialist International as a whole.

The attitude of the Socialist International and its member parties to the struggle waged by the peoples of Indochina and Middle East was a major factor impeding the growth of the influence of the Socialist International and its member parties on the developing nations. Over a number of years the Socialist International had been observing impassively the American aggression in Vietnam. When in the latter half of the 1960s a movement of solidarity with the people of Vietnam and other Indochinese countries started to grow, some of the major SI parties, above all the British Labour Party and the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, continued to support the US policy.

The Socialist International's position was equally unfriendly as regards the Arab nations. This was evidenced by the events related to the military conflict in the Middle East which broke out in June 1967. This conflict was a consequence of the expansionist policy of the Israeli rulers supported by the imperialists of the United States and other Western countries. However, the Socialist International put the blame for the growing tensions on the Arab countries and—the Soviet Union. Far from fostering restraint and a realistic attitude on the part of the then Israeli rulers, who were leaders of the Mapai Party, a Socialist International member, this posture of the International supported them morally and politically and, in fact, served to justify their aggressive actions.

All these factors hampered the consolidation of the positions of the Socialist International and its member parties in Asia, Africa and Latin America. That is why in the late 1960s the Socialist International failed to command any significant authority in the developing countries and gain the sympathy and support of their peoples and numerous socialist and revolutionary-democratic parties and movements.

### 3. The 1970s

In the 1970s the Socialist International's approach to the developing countries underwent considerable changes.

First of all, the leaders of social-democracy started to give much more attention to the problems of developing countries. Hans Janitschek, General Secretary of the Socialist International, who had visited many African and Latin American countries in 1969, urged the Social-Democrats to take greater notice of the problems besetting the developing countries, give heed to the arguments they advance, and strengthen ties with the socialist and democratic organisations functioning in Africa and Latin America.

The leaders of the Socialist International now had a different opinion of the successes scored by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America in their liberation struggle. Their former approach to the national liberation movement as a development provoked by communism gave way to a more realistic evaluation. The social-democratic leaders were forced to recognise the fact that the national liberation movements were not a result of underhand plotting by Moscow and the Communists but an inevitable consequence of the struggle of peoples for their independence, that these movements were led by true patriots and that their victory was inevitable. In his article "The Future of Southern Africa", published in the SI journal, Olof Palme wrote: "The liberation struggle can be restrained for a time by superior force, but sooner or later people's longing for freedom will break out. We have seen this happen in Vietnam and in the former Portuguese colonies. Efforts to stem the tide of this development serve only to intensify conflicts and attitudes and to impede future co-operation between peoples and countries. Instead, we should assist the nations in their efforts to gain independence and social justice."<sup>1</sup>

In the early 1970s the social-democratic parties and organisations were greatly impressed by the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people against the US aggression. A wide campaign to support the just cause of the Indochinese peoples was launched in various social-democratic organisations. A number of parties,

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 4-5, 1976, p. 110.

including those in Sweden, Finland and Japan, openly condemned the American aggression. The situation in Vietnam and other Indochinese countries was discussed at the 1971 Helsinki Conference of the Socialist International, the 12th SI Congress in Vienna and the meeting of the heads of Western European social-democratic parties held in January 1973 in Paris. The debate at the Vienna Congress was especially heated. While certain delegates tried to avoid condemnation of the US aggression, the representatives of the Swedish, Finnish, Dutch, Chilean, Venezuelan and other parties denounced the US imperialists. U. Sundqvist, for instance, said: "The war in Vietnam is raging as before, with the U. S. continuing her aggression against the Indo-Chinese peoples. It is a shame to democratic socialism if we fail to condemn this war and point out its real cause."<sup>1</sup>

The resolution of the 12th SI Congress called for an immediate end to the war in Vietnam, the withdrawal of all foreign troops, and a peaceful settlement on the basis of respect for the right of the peoples to determine their destiny without interference from without. It is important to note that the resolution expressed the International's concern over US ecological warfare. Although the Socialist International failed to exhibit enough courage to condemn the US aggression, the resolution it adopted essentially met the interests of the Vietnamese people and was in harmony with the demands to end the war and withdraw US troops from the territory of Vietnam and other Indochinese countries.

In the years following the 12th Congress, the Socialist International's interest in Asian countries waned. This is borne out by the fact that Asian problems were neither discussed at the 13th and 14th SI congresses nor mentioned in their resolutions.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s the International started to devote more attention to the problems facing Asian countries. They were discussed at the 15th SI Congress, which noted the disastrous situation in many countries of the continent where more than half of the world's population lives.

However, the SI leaders passed over in silence the imperialist and neo-colonialist policy pursued by the United States and other developed capitalist countries in Asia, the policy which

is largely responsible for the backwardness and poverty of Asian nations. Neither does the Congress resolution condemn the aggressive policy pursued by the US leadership in the area of the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, and the US support to the reactionary regimes in Pakistan, South Korea and some other countries in Asia.

The 15th SI Congress expressed its "great concern and deep sorrow at the tragedy of the people of Cambodia". It declared that all governments should help to overcome the "effects of this terrible genocide", that the "unity and integrity of Cambodia" should be respected, and that the Socialist International supported "any initiatives towards a solution which will secure a reconciliation of the Cambodian people and its neutrality status".<sup>1</sup>

It was certainly laudable that the Socialist International did not remain indifferent to the destiny of the Cambodian people and condemned the barbarous policy of genocide waged by the Pol Pot clique. At the same time, however, the appeal for "reconciliation" in fact implied support to the country's former rulers who, on the plea of "national reconciliation", would be prepared to overthrow the new regime in Kampuchea working for the consolidation of national independence and promoting social progress in their long-suffering country.

Thus, although at its 15th Congress the Socialist International devoted certain attention to Asian problems, its position was highly contradictory and in many respects inconsistent. The Socialist International failed to provide a well-substantiated analysis of the problems facing the Asian countries, to explain the reasons behind their disastrous position and the sources of tension, and to indicate ways and means of overcoming difficulties and strengthening peace in the region.

In the 1970s, the Socialist International considerably changed its attitude to the situation in the Middle East.

It is interesting to note that at its 12th Congress, held in 1972, the Socialist International, for the first time in many years did not adopt any resolutions on the Middle East. The fact of the matter is that unconditional support for Israel's policies was objected to by a number of SI member parties. Back in 1971,

<sup>1</sup> *New Times*, No. 29, July 1972, p. 21.

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1981, p. 22.

the representatives of the Social-Democratic Party of Finland at the SI Helsinki Conference voted against the resolution on the Middle East situation, while the leaders of the Swedish Social-Democrats abstained from the voting. By the time of the 12th Congress the differences on the Middle East issue had become even more acute. The SI leaders, unwilling to face an open clash at the Congress, decided therefore not to propose a special resolution on the issue.

During the new war which broke out in the Middle East in October 1973, the changes in the Socialist International's stand became even more obvious. Whereas in the past the Socialist International and its member parties had invariably sided with Israel, portraying it as the victim of aggression, this time neither the International nor the social-democratic parties and the governments they headed, except the government of the Netherlands, supported Israel.

The 1973 war in the Middle East, and the Arab countries' use of the "oil weapon" against countries which assisted Israel showed the social-democratic leaders how dangerous it was for their parties and governments to render unilateral support to Israel. They were forced to modify their stand by making efforts to work out a more balanced approach to the Middle East problem. Special measures were undertaken to establish contacts and co-operation with the leaders and parties of Arab countries. Between 1974 and 1976, the Socialist International dispatched three special missions, headed by the leader of the Austrian Socialist Party, Bruno Kreisky, to Arab countries. In March 1974, they visited Egypt, Syria and Israel; in February 1975, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya, in March 1976, Kuwait, Iraq, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Syria.

Bruno Kreisky summed up the results of the trips and the negotiations with Arab leaders in his report to the Socialist International. The conclusions he made provided a more objective picture of the situation in the Middle East and noticeably differed from the former positions of Western European social-democratic parties.

Kreisky noted that peace in the Middle East could be achieved "if Israel [were] prepared to return to the border of 1967"<sup>1</sup>. The

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1978, p. 6.

Socialist International's task, he noted, consisted in doing everything possible to reach a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem which would guarantee the right of the peoples of Israel and Palestine to exist. Kreisky emphasised that the Palestine Liberation Organisation had been recognised, in one form or another, by 103 countries. The Western powers, he said, should follow this example. The conclusion made by the SI special missions was that "a denial of the existence of the PLO by socialist parties would not only be ineffective but would also create feelings of a new hostility in the Arab world against the social-democratic movement."<sup>1</sup> Such conclusions testified to the considerable shifts in the positions of the European Social-Democrats and to the readiness of some parties to recognise the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples, including the Palestinian people.

However, in the late 1970s, when Sadat had embarked on a separate deal with Israel, the leaders of the Socialist International abandoned these positions and initiated actions to support the deal between the Egyptian and Israeli rulers.

On July 8 and 9, 1978 a meeting between Anwar Sadat and the leader of the Jewish Labour Party of Israel, Shimon Peres, was held. Afterwards Willy Brandt and Bruno Kreisky, who had also attended the meeting, published a statement in which they spoke about the withdrawal of the Israeli troops not from all the occupied territories but only from those within "the secure boundaries" to be determined in the course of peace negotiations. The statement did not specify who exactly was going to participate in these negotiations and in what status, and made no mention of the Palestine Liberation Organisation.

It is obvious that in the 1970s the positions of the Socialist International on the Middle East question were extremely conflicting. On the one hand, they displayed certain positive shifts and a desire to take into account the interests of the Arab peoples; on the other hand, they implied support for the separate actions by the United States, Egypt and Israel which cannot possibly help to solve the problems in question. This contradictoriness triggered controversy in the Socialist International's ranks and made it impossible to formulate a stand which would satisfy both the Western European and the non-European mem-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

bers of the International. Evidently, it is for this reason that the Socialist International desisted from discussing the Middle East problems and failed to adopt any resolutions on the matter either at its 13th or 14th congresses.

While the 15th SI Congress was taking place, Willy Brandt and Bruno Kreisky had another meeting with the Chairman of the Jewish Labour Party of Israel, Shimon Peres, and the Egyptian Foreign Minister, Boutros Boutros-Ghali. In the joint statement published after the meeting, its participants called upon the Arab states and Israel to initiate talks on a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem in accordance with UN Security Council resolutions 242 and 338.<sup>1</sup>

The joint statement was a compromise document. On the one hand, it talks about the necessity to support "the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people"; passes over the Camp David accords in silence and proposes solving the Middle East problem in accordance with the relevant UN resolutions. This, by and large, meets the interests of the Arab peoples. On the other hand, it does not say anything about the Palestine Liberation Organisation being the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, levels no criticism at Israel's actions to retain control over the occupied territories, and appeals to Jordan to take part in the talks with Israel, thereby supporting the so-called "Jordan version" of the Middle East settlement. These points of the statement, in effect, disregard the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people and signify a concession to Israel and the United States.

At the 15th Congress of the Socialist International, just as at the two preceding congresses, the Middle East problems were virtually not discussed at all.

The Socialist Workers' Party of Spain and the Socialist Party of Italy, backed by a number of other parties, in their draft resolution submitted to the Congress urged, among other things, recognition of the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian people and an equal partner in possible future talks. However this proposal failed to gain the support of the majority of the SI member parties. For this reason, the resolution adopted by the 15th Congress makes no mention of the PLO. Neither

<sup>1</sup> See: *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1981, p. 20.

does it mention the Camp David deal.<sup>1</sup> The latter is indicative of the fact that the SI leaders realise that the Camp David accords cannot lead to a settlement of the Middle East problem.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Socialist International started to devote more attention to the situation in Africa. The latter was the topic of a detailed debate during the 11th SI Congress held in 1969. Priority was given to the liberation struggle waged by the peoples in Portuguese colonies. The resolution adopted by the Congress condemned the ongoing exploitation of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea by the Portuguese fascist government and expressed its solidarity with the fighters against imperialism. For the first time in the International's history, the Congress noted in its resolution that the social-democratic parties in the EEC and NATO member countries were charged with a special responsibility and that they should urge their governments to impose all sorts of sanctions on Portugal to help eliminate its sway in the colonies. The Socialist International called on its parties to work towards strict compliance by the governments in their countries with the UN resolution on sanctions against Rhodesia. It urged the British government not to grant independence to Rhodesia until majority rule had been established in that country, and drew the attention of its member parties to "that section of the UN resolution which asks for 'moral and practical assistance' to those who are struggling for their freedom". The International condemned the apartheid system in South Africa and the continued occupation of Namibia.<sup>2</sup> This SI resolution generally met the interests of the liberation struggle in Africa.

Between 1972 and 1975 the SI member parties, in keeping with the decisions of the Socialist International, organised a number of events timed to coincide with May Days to raise funds to support the liberation struggle in the Portuguese colonies. The social-democratic parties in Britain, the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark and some other countries set up special funds to assist the African peoples. The Swedish Social-Democratic Party was the most active of all. The government it headed was the only Western government to render not only moral but also

<sup>1</sup> See: *SI*, No. 1, 1981, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> See: *SI*, No. 14, 1969, p. 141.

material assistance to the freedom fighters in the Portuguese colonies. On the whole, the stand taken by the Socialist International and its member parties helped isolate the Portuguese colonisers and facilitated the liberation struggle of the African peoples.

After the Portuguese colonies had gained independence, the Socialist International focused on the situation in southern Africa. The resolution of the 13th SI Congress held in November 1976 points out that "neutrality towards the existing and coming struggles in southern Africa is impossible. Between the exploiters and the exploited there is no middle ground".<sup>1</sup> The Socialist International declared that it fully condemned the apartheid regime and believed it its duty to urge the introduction of universal suffrage in southern Africa. "We call upon all governments," said the resolution, "to end their unhealthy involvement with apartheid," to impose economic sanctions on South Africa and render assistance to the liberation movements in the Republic of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe.

The leaders of the Socialist International recognised that in the existing conditions the armed struggle of the enslaved peoples in southern Africa was legitimate and unavoidable. Speaking at a session of the UN Security Council on March 25, 1977, Olof Palme said: "...It is easy to foresee that when people in search of peace and progress are met only by oppression and exploitation, they will ultimately resort to violence. The armed struggle becomes the last possible resort. Now, in Namibia and Zimbabwe, continued armed struggle seems to be unavoidable."<sup>2</sup>

In keeping with the decisions taken by the 13th Congress, the Socialist International organised a special mission to Africa headed by Olof Palme. In September 1977 it visited Angola, Zambia, Botswana, Mozambique and Tanzania.

The results of the trip and the report prepared by the mission were discussed at the session of the SI Bureau held in October 1977 in Madrid. The report points out that continued existence of racist regimes must not be tolerated any longer, that these regimes doom millions of Africans to exploitation and oppression and pose a threat to world peace. The report expres-

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1977, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 2, 1977, p. 49.

ses its support to all forms of liberation struggle waged by the African peoples, including armed struggle. Mindful of the use of violence by racist regimes, the report says: "There is no reason for people from abroad to moralize about the resort to arms..."<sup>1</sup>

The authors of the report stress that, in defiance of the declarations on sanctions, the racist regimes in the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia receive various forms of aid, such as armaments, the services of military advisers, know-how, loans, credits, and capital investment.

They point out that there is an obvious contradiction between the declarations condemning apartheid and the practical policy of Western powers vis-à-vis the apartheid regimes. The report exposes the futility of the efforts made by Vorster and Smith to picture their regimes as outposts in the struggle for democracy and progress in Africa.

Proceeding from their analysis of the situation in southern Africa, the authors of the report formulated a nine-point Programme of Action which, by and large, takes into account the demands of the liberation movements in southern Africa and those of the governments of frontline states supporting the liberation movements. Should this programme be accomplished, it might play a positive role in the struggle against the racist regimes and in supporting the liberation struggle of African peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. It is important to note that both the report of the mission and the programme it formulated were unanimously endorsed by the participants in the Madrid session of the SI Bureau.

The situation in southern Africa was also discussed at the 14th SI Congress in Vancouver. The interventions by Olof Palme, Lionel Jospin, Hans-Jürgen Wischnewski, and the Zambian representative, Roubess Kamanga, were devoted to this theme.

Olof Palme emphasised the importance of adopting the Programme of Action and especially the necessity for all social-democratic parties and governments to adhere to its principles. As to Namibia, Olof Palme pointed out that, despite the fact that SWAPO had made serious concessions and agreed to the UN project for Namibia, the Vorster regime in South Africa refused

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 6, 1977, pp. 145, 147.

to abide by the agreement which had already been reached. According to Palme, the Western countries were hypocritical in condemning apartheid verbally and, at the same time, maintaining business relations and military co-operation with South Africa's leadership.

The domination of the white minority over the black majority in South Africa, said Lionel Jospin, was a challenge to all Socialists. The SI member countries, he stressed, should urge their governments to struggle against the racist regimes through the methods proposed by the SI mission in Africa. This appeal was supported by one of the SPD leaders, Hans-Jürgen Wischniewski, who said that each state and each company that supplied arms to the RSA should be subjected to overt international boycott. He urged greater assistance to the frontline states of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Zambia and Tanzania.

The 15th SI Congress also devoted much attention to African problems. In its resolutions it condemned the apartheid regime and pointed out that the Socialist International urgently sought "from all parties and governments their assistance for all the African countries fighting racism and apartheid, especially the frontline states".<sup>1</sup> The Socialist International condemned South Africa's aggression against Angola and expressed its support to the African National Congress and SWAPO. The International expressed its satisfaction with Zimbabwe having gained independence and voiced its intention to urge independence for and majority rule in Namibia.

Among other important resolutions of the 15th Congress was the one which stated the Socialist International's recognition of the right of the people of the Sahara to self-determination in conformity with the resolutions adopted by the Organisation of African Unity and the United Nations. The Socialist International called upon the Polisario Front and Morocco to reach a peaceful, political settlement of the conflict through negotiations, as had been the case with Mauritania.

In the 1970s, the Socialist International devoted particular attention to the problems of Latin America. There appeared new, positive elements in its stand on the struggle waged by the Latin American peoples.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1, 1981, p. 23.

Thus, at its Helsinki Conference held in 1971 the Socialist International declared its condemnation of oppression and all forms of political, economic and social dependence which existed in the majority of Latin American countries. The Socialist International came out against foreign interference in the internal affairs of Latin American countries.

These issues continued to be discussed by the SI leaders at the Santiago Bureau meeting in February 1973. This was the first time in the history of the Socialist International that its Bureau met in Latin America. The meeting was attended by the representatives of almost all Western European social-democratic parties. The delegates were received by Salvador Allende.

In an extensive resolution the SI Bureau expressed its support to the liberation struggle waged by the Latin American peoples and recognised their right to use means and methods "appropriate to the needs of Latin America".<sup>2</sup> The Bureau voiced its full support to those parties which worked towards the implementation of land reforms. According to the Bureau's resolution, the Latin American land reform should be based on the following two principles: "the land must satisfy the basic needs of the population of each country in terms of agricultural products and ... the land should be owned by those who work it". The resolution also pointed out that "the process of development requires that the principal resources of any country must be nationally owned, and not continue to be a source of profit for private companies and corporations in the rich countries". "We are aware," declared the leaders of the Socialist International, "that ... acts of expropriation within the framework of law are necessary and are not primarily ideologically motivated."<sup>2</sup>

The Socialist International and its member parties expressed their support to the democratic forces in Chile, acclaimed the victory of Salvador Allende at the presidential elections and repeatedly voiced their support to the Popular Unity government.

In early 1973, *Socialist Affairs*, the journal of the Socialist

<sup>2</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 2, 1973, p. 47.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.



International, published Salvador Allende's speech at the UN General Assembly session on December 4, 1972, in which he exposed the subversive activity of the imperialists against Chile and its democratically-elected government. Never before had the official organ of the Socialist International issued any material to expose the policy of the imperialist powers, above all the United States, vis-à-vis the developing countries so convincingly and relentlessly.

The Socialist International condemned the military coup in Chile and called upon its member parties to assist Chilean Democrats in the struggle against the reactionary fascist junta.

The statement by the SI Bureau read: "Recent developments in Chile were the result of a continued campaign by reactionary and imperialist forces inside and outside of Chile against the lawfully established Government of President Salvador Allende." The Bureau called upon all the SI member parties to urge their governments to refrain from taking any diplomatic steps which could be interpreted and viewed by the military junta as a sign of these governments' reconciling themselves to the political situation in Chile. The democratic governments, the resolution went on to say, should stop giving any kind of aid, credits and loans to the military regime and get all international monetary organisations and institutions to follow suit.<sup>1</sup>

The Bureau of the Socialist International called upon all its member parties to use all means at their disposal to defend human rights, to secure the release of political prisoners, support political emigrés from other Latin American countries and stop the terror in Chile. The Bureau demanded the restoration of democracy and freedom. It insisted that the anti-fascist political parties and trade unions whose activities had been banned should be restored in their rights and called on the SI member parties to be active in working towards these goals.<sup>2</sup>

Never before had the Socialist International been so resolute and firm in defending the democratic forces. In his article "The Assassination of Democracy", Bruno Pittermann emphasised that the democratic government in Chile had been overthrown

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 5, 1973, p. 89.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

not only by the internal reactionary forces but also by the reactionary forces of monopoly capitalism, with the support of US capitalism.<sup>1</sup> In March 1974, the Socialist International set up an ad hoc committee to co-ordinate actions to be taken by social-democratic parties against the fascist regime and in support of the Chilean Democrats. The committee was instrumental in launching a large-scale campaign of solidarity with the Chilean people in many countries of the capitalist world.

In August 1977, the Socialist International held a conference on Chilean problems in Rotterdam. Its chief aim was to help establish dialogue and co-operation between the Popular Unity Front and the Christian-Democratic Party in the struggle against the fascist regime. The CDP refused to participate in the conference, however. The parties of the Popular Unity Front, on the other hand, sent their representatives to Rotterdam. The exchange of opinions showed that the parties of the Popular Unity Front and the Socialist International were determined to continue the struggle to eliminate the fascist regime in Chile.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the problems of Latin America were in the focus of the Socialist International. They were debated at length at the 13th, 14th and 15th congresses of the International and at the sessions of its Bureau held between 1977 and 1981. A representative of the Latin American parties was given a seat in the SI Secretariat. An SI Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean was formed, and was headed by the Prime Minister of Jamaica, Michael Manley. In March 1978, an SI mission, led by the leader of the Socialist Party of Portugal, Mario Soares, visited Mexico, Costa Rica, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica.

The 14th SI Congress in Vancouver devoted much attention to the problems of Latin America. The very choice of the venue was determined by the European social-democratic leaders' desire to demonstrate their interest in the region and its problems and to promote ties and co-operation with Latin American democratic parties and movements.

In its resolution on Latin America the Congress came out against the dictatorial regimes and the states which gave them

<sup>1</sup> See: *Socialist Affairs*, No. 5, 1973, p. 84.

aid, including military aid. The resolution described the actions taken by the Somoza regime against the people of Nicaragua as barbarous and expressed hope that the elimination of this regime would lead to the democratisation of both Nicaragua and the whole of Central America. The participants in the Congress called upon "all governments, particularly those who have for so long maintained the Somoza regime in power, to end their support".<sup>1</sup>

The Socialist International called upon the governments in Latin America to put an end to unlawful action, arbitrary arrests, torture and murder, and demanded that political freedoms and the rights of all parties and trade unions to function legally be restored.

The First Regional Conference of the Socialist International for Latin America and the Caribbean held in Santo Domingo, the Dominican Republic, from March 26 to 28, 1980, was a milestone in the history of the Socialist International. The objective of the Conference was to overcome fragmentation and isolation of socialist, democratic and anti-imperialist forces in Latin America, and to pool their efforts in the struggle for the independence of Latin American countries, and for social progress.

The Conference was attended by the representatives of 57 parties and organisations. Apart from the delegations of Latin American parties, the Conference was attended by the prominent figures of Western European social-democracy, including Willy Brandt, François Mitterrand and Mário Soares.

The Conference discussed both the overall situation in Latin America and the state of affairs in its individual countries. In their resolution, the conferees noted the pernicious consequences of the imperialist activity in the region. The resolution said: "Today, hegemony takes on more sophisticated forms by means of control exercised through the pre-eminence of the transnational corporations, which are allied with the national bourgeoisie serving foreign and monopolistic interests."<sup>2</sup> In addition to the super-exploitation of the workers, said the resolution, the Latin American countries suffered from fascism and the "doctrine of

national security" used as a pretext for the state-sponsored terror and the assassination of political opponents.

Important statements were included in the sections of the resolution dealing with the situation in the individual Latin American countries: Bolivia, Chile, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Puerto Rico and Uruguay.

In their resolution on Chile the delegates condemned in the strongest terms the military government there, expressed their solidarity with all Chilean Democrats, and urged governments, regional and international organisations, trade unions, political parties, workers, students and intellectuals "to continue the political, diplomatic and cultural isolation of the Chilean dictatorship".<sup>1</sup>

In the resolution on Honduras the delegates expressed their solidarity with the struggle of the Honduran people for genuine independence, democracy and social progress. The Conference denounced the attempts to turn Honduras into "the counter-revolutionary base of Central America", and the efforts to use its army and people for interfering in the internal affairs of the neighbouring countries.<sup>2</sup>

In the resolution on Nicaragua the delegates denounced "the slander campaign against the Nicaraguan revolution" and the US policy calculated to "suffocate Nicaragua's economic development".<sup>3</sup>

The problems of Latin America were placed high on the agenda of the 15th Congress of the Socialist International. The International reiterated its solidarity with the Latin American peoples fighting for freedom, democracy and social progress. The delegates noted with satisfaction the successes scored by the democratic forces in the Dominican Republic and Ecuador. The Socialist International reaffirmed its support for the Sandinista Front for National Liberation in Nicaragua, the New Jewel Movement in Grenada, the Revolutionary Democratic Front in El Salvador and the Democratic Front Against Repression in Guatemala.

The Socialist International called on the government of the United States "to end its political and military support for the

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1, 1979, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 3, 1980, pp. 63-64.

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 3, 1980, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

present junta in El Salvador ... a despotic regime whose activities have led to a state of civil war".<sup>1</sup> The resolution of the Congress voiced concern over the pronouncements by Ronald Reagan, then a presidential candidate, in support of the dictatorships in El Salvador and Guatemala and his attacks on the regimes in Nicaragua and Grenada. The Resolution stressed that the Socialist International "will regard the new administration's attitude towards Latin America and the Caribbean as a signal of its posture in the whole world. In the 1980s, the growth of further dictatorship, or of democracy, social justice and respect of human rights in the region will be significantly affected by the United States. But the attitude of the United States itself will be determined to a large extent by the pressure of international public opinion."<sup>2</sup>

Thus, the Socialist International not only condemned Reagan's position in Latin America, but also called upon its member parties and the world public at large to bring pressure to bear upon the US Administration to force it to stop supporting the reactionary forces and assailing democratic regimes in Latin America and the Caribbean. This was a new facet of the activity of the Socialist International which met the interests of the Latin American peoples fighting for their liberation.

Among the important results of the Madrid Congress was the setting up of the Socialist International Committee for the Defence of the Revolution in Nicaragua. It is noteworthy that the first session of the Committee, held in Washington in December 1980, was timed to coincide with the Conference on Eurosocialism and America. This fact lent special importance to the Committee's work and drew the attention of the US and Latin American democratic public to Nicaragua. The next meeting of the Committee was held on June 25, 1981 in Managua, the capital of Nicaragua. This act of solidarity with the Nicaraguan revolution and its leading force, the Sandinista National Liberation Front, undermined the slander campaign launched by the imperialists of the United States and other countries against the revolutionary regime in Nicaragua, consolidated the positions of this regime and enhanced the confidence in it on the

part of socialist and democratic parties and organisations in Western Europe and Latin America.

The situation in Central America was repeatedly discussed during the 1981 and 1982 meetings of the leaders of the Socialist International. In September 1981, the SI Bureau passed a special resolution on El Salvador. It censured the US administration for rendering considerable military aid to the Salvadoran junta. The International expressed its full support for the joint declaration issued by the French and Mexican governments to voice their solidarity with the liberation forces of El Salvador. The Socialist International's resolution stressed "the need for a comprehensive political solution in El Salvador in which the alliance of the FDR-FMLN [the Revolutionary Democratic Front and the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front] should participate as an important political representative force."<sup>3</sup>

The second half of the 1970s brought into focus the problems involved in the establishment of a new world economic system. As is well known, the demand to establish a new economic system was advanced by the developing countries. It reflected their legitimate aspiration to liberate themselves from the economic domination of imperialist states and transnational monopolies, and to achieve more favourable conditions for maintaining trade, financial, technical and other contacts in the world arena. The Socialist International could not ignore the demands put forward by the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The new economic system issue was first discussed at the 13th SI Congress held in Geneva. The debate revealed significant differences in the approach to the issue. The representatives of developing countries insisted on mapping out concrete measures to be taken by the parties and governments of developed capitalist countries to change the unjust system of economic relations between the developed and the developing countries. Numerous facts were cited to illustrate the disastrous situation in the developing countries and the need to urgently assist them. Thus, President Léopold Sédar Senghor of Senegal severely criticised the economic policies of Western powers and stressed that the new international economic order could be achieved only if the

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1, 1981, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 6, 1981, p. 209.

developed Western nations pledged to adopt a new approach to the developing countries.

It should be noted that the journal of the Socialist International published only a small part of President Senghor's speech, the one which neither contained criticism of the Western policy vis-à-vis the third world nor set forth the developing countries' demand to end the Western powers' colonialist practices, modify the terms of trade, ensure just prices for third world products and make concrete efforts for a new world economic order.

An unseemly picture of the policies pursued by the governments of developed capitalist countries, including those headed by Social-Democrats, was depicted by President Daniel Oduber of Costa Rica. He pointed out that unfair international trade relations created serious difficulties for the developing countries. These difficulties arise, in particular, from the fact that the prices imposed on third world products by the world market were much lower than those that could be described as fair and reasonable and also from the restrictions the industrialised countries impose on the exports from the developing countries. "We are, therefore, concerned," said President Oduber, "about those governments which, while committed internally to seeking ever-increasing social justice, do not apply the same criteria to their actions on the world stage." Addressing the leaders of the European Social-Democrats, President Oduber said: "The prices of the industrial products which you export from Europe to our countries enable your citizens to live well. The prices of certain primary products which we sell to your countries force us to live badly. These double standards work clearly to the disadvantage of poor countries and allow selfishness to triumph over solidarity. These practices should be set aside by all social democratic governments."<sup>1</sup>

A similar reproach was levelled against the European Social-Democrats by President Carlos Andrés Pérez of Venezuela. "We feel," he said, "that the justice, equity and international co-operation proper to the social democratic governments of Europe are not extended to the developing countries. On the contrary, some intrinsic features of capitalism such as a well-developed competitive sense and self-seeking seem to have crept into the

international conduct of the social democrats in power, who turn a blind eye to living conditions in the marginal countries that are producers of raw materials. The promotion of national economic interests is contradictory to the principles of socialist solidarity."<sup>2</sup>

The fairness of the charges advanced by the representatives of developing countries was recognised by the leaders of some Western European social-democratic parties. Thus, the Dutch Prime Minister, Joop Den Uyl, said: "Speaking as a representative of a rich country I feel much more ashamed that we, the rich countries, have done so little to overcome the poverty of the Third World."<sup>3</sup> The delegate of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party, Ziegler, acknowledged that the social-democratic parties of Western Europe were not yet prepared to solve such a task as the establishment of new economic relations with the developing countries.<sup>4</sup>

Nonetheless, some of the Western European social-democratic leaders in effect ignored the appeal of the developing countries' representatives to radically alter world economic relations. This was made manifest in the address of FRG Chancellor Helmut Schmidt to the Geneva Congress. He said that before solving the problem of establishing a new world order things should be put in order in each country. In other words, he gave priority to stemming the economic difficulties experienced by the capitalist countries resulting from the 1974-1976 crisis.

However, the majority of the Socialist International's leaders did not share Schmidt's approach. They could not openly disregard the demand advanced by the representatives of Asian, African and Latin American countries, as that would create additional difficulties for the activity of Western European social-democracy in the newly-free countries and generate more contradictions between the developed and the developing countries.

The resolution on international economic solidarity adopted by the 13th Congress stated that the capitalist system "has failed abjectly to provide harmonious economic solutions between the nations". The resolution pointed out that the automatic functioning of the market mechanism could not provide conditions

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1977, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1977, p. 30.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

for equality and justice both in individual countries and in the world arena. "Consequently," the resolution went on, "nations must be willing, in appropriate ways, to take corrective measures to create a massive redistribution of wealth and income." These measures, according to the resolution, should become a component of a new international economic system "based on principles of solidarity and comprising the whole of mankind".<sup>1</sup>

However, having proclaimed the drive for a new international economic order and for a just redistribution of wealth and income its major goal, the Socialist International failed to chart a clear-cut programme for reaching it. Moreover, the resolution included a thesis similar to the one advanced by Helmut Schmidt. It pointed out that not any one state should use its natural wealth as a political or economic lever with respect to other countries. This thesis is directed primarily against those developing countries which produce oil, coffee, india rubber, cotton, etc., and which seek to pool efforts in defending their positions on the world market.

The new world economic system issue was debated at the 14th SI Congress in Vancouver. The resolution adopted by the Congress repeated the general propositions of the resolution passed by the 13th Congress concerning the difficulties experienced by some developing countries, the need to change the character of international economic relations, and the growing interdependence between the economies of the developed and the emergent states. However, unlike the previous resolution, the one adopted at the 14th Congress took greater heed of the interests of the developing countries and formulated some of their demands more concretely. It spoke of the need to establish such prices of the raw materials and other goods produced by the developing countries that would stabilise and increase their real income, the importance of securing guaranteed markets for their manufactured goods; their right to decide on their own which industries to develop; the need to solve the problem of their enormous foreign debts; and the urgency of greater financial and technical aid.<sup>2</sup>

In 1977, Willy Brandt was put at the head of a non-govern-

mental commission composed of prominent public figures and experts from various countries, which was charged with studying the problems of the developing countries and the relationships between the North and the South. In 1980, the Brandt Commission completed its work and published a report. The report described the difficult economic situation in many countries of the South, pointed out that there was a widening gap between the rich and the poor nations, and emphasised the danger of the global instability of international economic relations. Indeed, in early 1980, the foreign debt of the South ran to 400 billion dollars, while the number of people living in poverty topped 800 million.

The main principles and conclusions of the Brandt commission's report provided the groundwork for the discussion of these problems at the 15th SI Congress. The resolution adopted by the Congress formulated a number of propositions designed to promote the establishment of a new international economic order, propositions which, by and large, met the interests of the developing countries.

However, the Western states, including those headed by the leaders of social-democratic parties, were in no hurry to implement the resolutions adopted by the Socialist International.

This can be illustrated by the meeting of the representatives of the countries of the North and the South in October 1981 in Cancun, Mexico. The meeting was organised on the initiative of Chancellor Bruno Kreisky of Austria and President Portillo of Mexico. It was attended by the heads of state and government of eight industrialised capitalist countries—the United States, Canada, Japan, the FRG, France, Britain, Sweden and Austria—and developing countries—Mexico, Venezuela, Brazil, Guyana, the Philippines, India, Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia, Nigeria, Tanzania, Algeria, Ivory Coast, Yugoslavia and China.

Despite all the appeals by the developing countries, however, the developed countries, and, above all, the United States, refused to make concrete commitments to give more favourable credits to the developing countries, secure for their products an easier access to capitalist markets, establish higher and more stable prices for their raw materials, offer more favourable terms for oil purchases and render direct aid in the area of food supplies and energy resources. The most intransigent position was

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> See: *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1979, pp. 26-27.

taken by the US President. Reagan's speech at the meeting boiled down to claiming that self-sufficiency, open markets and private enterprise are more effective means for remedying the economic ills plaguing the developing countries than international aid. To quote from one of the leaders of the British Labour Party, Denis Healey: "The Third World as a whole has been appalled by America's apparent indifference to its problems."<sup>1</sup>

Some Western European social-democratic leaders, among them François Mitterrand and Bruno Kreisky, on the whole supported the demands advanced by the representatives of the developing countries. They failed, however, to have any significant influence on the outcome of the Cancún meeting. As a result, the meeting was unproductive for the developing countries.

Thus, there are numerous facts proving that the Socialist International's policy vis-à-vis the liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America and its approach to the problems facing the developing countries in the 1970s and early 1980s were contradictory and ambiguous. However, by and large, the Socialist International and its major member parties displayed a shift towards a more realistic, anti-colonial and anti-imperialist stand. This was embodied in their more consistent support rendered to the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America and their condemnation of the apartheid regime in South Africa and the fascist, military dictatorships in Latin America.

While taking notice of these facts, one should not forget that there is a wide gap between the words and deeds of the social-democratic leaders. They seldom back up their statements denouncing imperialism, colonialism and racism with action. For instance, although it opposed the war in Vietnam, the Socialist International failed to offer any effective assistance to the Vietnamese freedom fighters. And, while calling for peace in the Middle East, it has failed to persuade the Mapai leaders to give up their unreasonable, unrealistic stand and has also failed to make any kind of significant contribution to the solution of the Middle East problem. Nor has it carried out its intentions with regard to the racist regime in the Republic of South Africa and the liberation of Namibia. More, the Socialist

International's appeals to render economic and financial aid to the government of the Popular Unity Front in Chile and to Michael Manley's democratic government in Jamaica were not backed up by concrete action, and the Socialist International's repeated calls to establish a new international economic order have not been translated into life. Finally, the Western European social-democratic leaders are hesitant and inconsistent in criticising the policy pursued by the United States and other Western powers vis-à-vis Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The SI leaders are at times forced to admit that there is a gap between what they say and what they do. Thus, Bernt Carlsson, addressing the 14th SI Congress, said: "It is obvious that, as in the case of our support for the liberation struggle of southern Africa, sometimes a river of words is emptied into a desert of inaction."<sup>2</sup>

Nonetheless, it would be unjust to disregard the changes in the Socialist International's policy towards the national liberation movements and the developing countries that occurred in the 1970s.

What caused these changes? What do they imply? It is not easy to give a simple and straightforward answer to these questions. The reasons for this evolution in the Socialist International's position, as well as the motivations which influenced its leaders to alter their policy, are highly diversified.

The shifts in the Socialist International's positions were engendered primarily by the profound changes in the alignment of political forces and by the successes which were scored by the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America, successes which made the social-democratic leaders recognise the historical inevitability of this movement and its vast importance both for the future of the former colonial and dependent countries and for that of the world as a whole. The SI leaders were compelled to re-evaluate many of their former positions, and to adjust their policies in line with the new situation and the new alignment of world forces.

The developments in the zone of the national liberation movement had a great impact on how the Socialist International perceived the path of development of the newly-free countries,

<sup>1</sup> *The Sunday Times*, January 17, 1982, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1979, p. 19.



and the methods to be used by the democratic forces in their struggle against the reactionary racist regimes and dictatorships. The Socialist International acknowledged that the countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America could embark on many different roads according to the specific conditions prevailing in each country, and that in certain circumstances the use of force and armed struggle against the reactionary regimes in southern Africa and the military dictatorships in Latin America might prove inevitable. A declaration adopted at the Caracas Conference held in May 1976 announces that "there is no universally valid solution to arriving at a comprehensive democracy. Each country and each region must find its own path to freedom and social justice in accordance with prevailing conditions and growing international solidarity".<sup>1</sup>

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the movement of solidarity with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America acquired new dimensions in the capitalist countries of the West. Of special importance were the campaigns supporting the struggle waged by the Vietnamese people, by the peoples in the former Portuguese colonies and in southern Africa, by the Democrats in Chile and other Latin American countries. Many Social-Democrats took an active part in the solidarity campaigns. An increasing number of rank-and-file Socialists became critical of their leaders' stands on issues relating to the national liberation movement. They called on their leaders to work out a position which would conform to the socialist ideals and would contribute to the strengthening of the independence and progressive development of the newly-free countries.

International detente and the resultant weakening of the anti-Soviet and anti-communist tendencies in the SI ranks were important factors fostering change in the positions of the Socialist International and its member parties. Many Social-Democrats began to realise more clearly that it was not the Soviet Union and the Communists that posed a threat to democracy and the free development of the emergent nations, but the fascist, racist and other reactionary forces backed by the US imperialists. The awareness of this threat was largely promoted by the events in Chile and other developing countries where reactionary regimes

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 4-5, 1976, p. 96.

came to power. The leadership of the Socialist International and its member parties began to more consistently oppose dictatorships in the emergent states and support the democratic forces.

One should also take note that against the background of detente and the growing national liberation movement the open alliance between the European Social-Democrats and the American ruling circles came to be increasingly criticised both by the democratic organisations in the developing countries, primarily those in Latin America, and by the left wing of the European social-democratic parties. The US rulers were exposed before the world public as the worst enemies of the peoples fighting for independence, especially in Vietnam, as the champions of the racist regimes in Africa, as the accomplices of military and fascist dictatorships in Latin America. This situation required that the Socialist International take a more independent stand, dissociate itself from the United States and condemn the latter's most brazen imperialist actions.

An article appearing in 1978 in the SI journal pointed out that the imperialist policy is a present reality and not just a thing of the past. This policy is, according to the article, "a very real and tragic truth" for many countries of Latin America where "small tyrants or corrupt governments" were kept in power "for the North American companies to hold a dominant position controlling the economic and political affairs of the countries concerned". "Therefore," the article stressed, "European socialists should not be satisfied with denouncing the crimes committed by these dictatorships. To remain credible, they must also attack the imperialism that has installed them."<sup>2</sup>

In the 1970s, the number and the influence of parties from the developing (primarily Latin American) countries in the Socialist International considerably increased. The SI leaders were compelled to give heed to their stands and points of view.

Thus, the changes in the positions of the Socialist International were determined, above all, by the fact that its leadership responded to the new situation in the world and recognised the former policy of the right-wing Socialists as bankrupt. These changes implied concessions to the national liberation movements and the left-wing forces within social-democracy.

<sup>2</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1978, p. 16.

At the same time, the changes in the Socialist International's policies were also prompted by the special interests and considerations of the European Social-Democrats. The International's increasing interest in the newly-free countries, and its willingness to alter its positions in accordance with the demands of the emergent nations were largely prompted by the desire of the European social-democratic leaders to cement ties and improve relations with the developing countries at the cost of certain adjustments in their policy. This was necessary in order to solve the economic problems facing the Western European states in the setting of an increasingly severe energy crisis and the serious difficulties involved in providing industry with certain raw materials, such as oil, non-ferrous and rare metals, diamonds, etc. The economic crisis also put a damper on marketing and investment opportunities. In their search for a solution to these problems the social-democratic leaders were forced to adapt their policies to the new climate in the relations between the developed and developing countries. The Socialist International's leaders were now better aware of the fact that economic growth in the developed countries is increasingly dependent on economic growth in the developing nations and that the aid rendered to them is not a sacrifice or charity on the part of the rich capitalist powers but a necessary prerequisite for the economic development of the West and for its maintaining the present standard of living and level of employment.

Commenting on the changes in the Socialist International's position on the Middle East, Bruno Kreisky stated: "For over twenty years I have pleaded within the Socialist International for contacts with the Arab world, but in view of Golda Meir's resistance my efforts must have seemed akin to those of Don Quixote. After the oil crisis broke, however, my proposal to set up a commission to study the possibilities of a peaceful resolution of the Middle East conflict was adopted unanimously. . . The new open-mindedness is certainly prompted by economic considerations."<sup>1</sup> Uwe Holtz, a prominent figure in the SPD, Member of Parliament, and Chairman of the Bundestag Commission on Economic Co-operation, wrote in *Die Neue Gesellschaft* that the use of the "oil weapon" by the Arab countries made it man-

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 2, 1980, p. 32.

ifest that "our future economic policy cannot but take into account the basic interests of the developing countries". Currently, he noted, it is widely recognised that the solution to the problem of jobs in the FRG depends heavily on the Third World.<sup>1</sup>

The increasingly bitter struggle for raw material resources and markets between the Western European countries and the United States has made social-democratic leaders reconsider their economic relations with the United States, which they view as their chief rival.

Considerations related to the desire of the Social-Democrats to ensure the security of their states also play an important role in the evolution of the Socialist International's positions. Social-democratic leaders realise that the growing gap between the levels of economic development of the developed and developing countries may lead to the worsening of relations and sharp political and military clashes between them. In this connection, SPD Secretary Egon Bahr, wrote that there are only two options: "either to remain deaf to the demands advanced by the developing countries at the risk that the increasing number of poor countries will one day take what they have not been given, or promote their economic and political consolidation which would be useful for all the parties engaged in the world economy".<sup>2</sup>

The changes in the positions taken by the Socialist International's leaders were also caused by their desire to beef up the authority of European social-democracy in Asia, Africa and Latin America, to secure favourable conditions for the spread of the ideas of "democratic socialism" in these continents, and to turn social-democracy into a political force able to influence the policy of the developing countries and their choice of the direction of social development.

The leaders of the Socialist International and its major member parties realise that they will be unable to cope with this problem unless they gain the confidence of the peoples in these continents. They are well aware of the fact that in order to realise their goals they must take into account the needs and requirements of these peoples and demonstrate their willingness

<sup>1</sup> *Die Neue Gesellschaft*, No. 11, 1975, pp. 885-86.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Neue Gesellschaft*, No. 8, 1976, p. 633.

to render them aid and support. They also realise that they cannot stand to gain influence in this part of the world by saddling the newly-free nations and their leading parties and regimes with positions which disregard local conditions. All this has compelled the Western European Social-Democrats to alter their positions. Willy Brandt, speaking at the 15th SI Congress, said: "We have undertaken greater efforts to spread our influence beyond Europe and beyond industrialised states. I realise that these efforts have only met with success. In some regions, we have accomplished more than in others. Yet we all remain aware of one hard fact: without more profound cooperation with the new forces emerging from a thoroughly different background to our own in many parts of the world, the International will lose its credibility as well as its capacity to help in shaping the future in any way at all."<sup>1</sup>

Involving a greater number of socialist and democratic organisations from Asia, Africa and Latin America in the Socialist International's ranks is seen by its leaders as an important instrument to broaden their influence in the world. In the 1970s, they succeeded in considerably increasing the International's membership, primarily by recruiting new member parties from Latin America. However, many democratic and national liberation parties and organisations, including a number of ruling parties and movements in these three continents, especially Africa, refrained from joining the Socialist International.

Cognisant of the fact, the Socialist International's leadership sought to establish contacts with them by setting up regional associations of socialist and democratic organisations. For instance, they took pains to create a regional organisation for Asia. The problem had been repeatedly discussed by the Socialist International's bodies as early as the 1960s. In 1972, they finally managed to convene the first conference of the so-called Asia-Pacific Socialist Organisation comprising nine parties. However, as subsequent developments were to show, this child of the Socialist International was stillborn. It remained inactive for a number of years, and not until 1981 was it revived. In February 1981, the first conference of this organisation was held in Sydney. But this time, too, the Socialist International's efforts bore very modest results: the organisation was joined by only five parties

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1981, p. 7.

from four countries (Japan, Australia, New Zealand and Malaysia), all of which were already members of the Socialist International. This indicates that over a number of years the Socialist International was incapable of attracting a single new organisation from this immense region.

No small effort was made by the Western European social-democratic leaders to create a regional organisation for Africa. The SI leaders regarded as truly democratic only those parties and organisations which adhered to the multi-party principle and operated in countries with multi-party political systems. As to the one-party regimes, the International regarded them as undemocratic and refrained from active co-operation with such ruling parties. This posture isolated the Socialist International from the numerous democratic and national liberation parties and movements in African countries. To overcome this isolation the European social-democratic leaders were forced to forfeit their principles and declare that democratic parties with which it was admissible and desirable to co-operate could be found even under one-party regimes. This thesis was formulated in the document entitled "The African Roads to Socialism" adopted by the 11th SI Congress in 1969.

After this the SI leadership started to make more vigorous efforts towards setting up a regional organisation of the Socialist International in Africa.

The first attempt to carry out this plan was made in 1975. However, the majority of the 26 parties attending the conference in Tunisia opposed the idea of setting up an association which would function as an SI regional organisation and be based, politically and ideologically, on the doctrine of "democratic socialism". At the 1977 meeting of the representatives of a number of African parties in Dakar the initiators of a regional organisation suffered another setback.

Finally, an association of African parties, the so-called African Socialist International, was set up in February 1981. But it was created as an independent organisation, and not as a regional organisation of the Socialist International. Besides, it comprised only 11 parties from 9 African countries. Many of them did not share the ideals of social-democracy. Such influential African parties and organisations as MPLA (Angola), FRELIMO (Mozambique), ZANU (Zimbabwe), ANC (South Africa), SWAPO

(Namibia) and some others refused to join the African Socialist International.

In recent years, Western European Social-Democrats have been devoting special attention to the development of ties with parties and organisations in Latin America. Mindful of the difficulties that hampered the creation of regional SI organisations in Asia and Africa and of the setbacks suffered by the Latin American Secretariat of the Socialist International, the SI leaders decided not to press forward the idea of founding its regional organisation in Latin America. They adopted the following approach: to admit non-social-democratic, primarily popular organisations into the International and to organise co-operation with Latin American parties on a broader basis exceeding the International's framework.

This form of co-operation was advocated by some leaders of the Western European Social-Democrats as early as the late 1960s and early 1970s. In particular it was set forth in an article by Karl Czernetz published in the Socialist International's journal in 1971. Subsequent to the collapse of the colonial empires, he wrote, there emerged "social revolutionary parties, national democratic parties, anti-imperialist movements, national-revolutionary and national democratic alliances of all kinds" in many countries. According to Czernetz, many of these parties and organisations are in sympathy with the social-democratic parties and the Socialist International. But serious difficulties still mar the relations with these parties and organisations, since many of them "do not want to make politically binding alliances or to submit to the statutory regulations of the Socialist International".<sup>1</sup> These difficulties, Czernetz noted, had largely been removed by introducing the status of an associated and consultant member. But still, he stressed, there remained many parties outside the Socialist International which were close to the Social-Democrats in their spirit. In this connection, Czernetz posed the following question: "Could the Socialist International not form a world alliance with these allied parties? ... The world alliance of the Socialist International would be only a very loosely based alliance. The Socialist International itself would not change its existing character."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 7, 1971, p. 142.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 143.

Addressing the September 1975 Congress of the Swedish Social-Democratic Party, Willy Brandt stressed: "We must increasingly learn to act in concert with the political forces in other parts of the world whose aims are similar to our own. In this context—outside and beyond the traditional framework of the Socialist International—the concept of alliance for progress could take on new meaning."<sup>1</sup>

The conference of the representatives of the socialist and democratic parties of Western Europe and Latin America held in May 1976 in Caracas constituted a first step towards implementing this plan.

Although the discussion revealed considerable differences in the approach to Latin American and other international problems, all the speakers supported the idea of co-operation between the democratic parties in Europe and Latin America. The SI leaders were satisfied with the overall results of the conference. To quote from *Die Zukunft*, the journal of the Socialist Party of Austria, "European social-democracy has begun laying a bridge towards the movements and parties in Latin America which up to now have been far away from it."<sup>2</sup>

In subsequent years the Socialist International made significant efforts to develop relations and contacts with the parties and organisations in Latin America and to draw them in their ranks.

In 1978, the Socialist International set up a special committee on Latin America. Exploring ways to further intensify the Socialist International's activities in Latin American countries, the SI mission, which visited some Latin American countries in March 1978, recommended that measures should be taken to involve new members in the International, that an SI information and propaganda centre be set up in Latin America, and that the Committee's effective work on Latin American issues be facilitated.

Of great importance for implementing these recommendations was the holding of the 14th SI Congress in Canada in November 1978 and the first regional SI Conference in Santo Domingo in March 1980.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 6, 1975, p. 118.

<sup>2</sup> *Die Zukunft*, No. 13-14, 1976, p. 1.

Although the Socialist International has succeeded in expanding its operations in Latin America and exerting certain influence upon the development of democratic, anti-imperialist parties and movements on the continent, on the whole its positions and influence outside Western Europe are still limited.

Many actions taken by the Socialist International are prompted not by the unselfish desire to help the liberation forces in the developing countries, but by the desire to attain its own ideological and political goals. Therefore, the consequences of the Socialist International's activities in the Third World can be both positive and negative. For instance, the attempts of the European Social-Democrats to saddle the workers' and democratic organisations in the emergent countries with the concept of "democratic socialism" as opposed to the concept of scientific socialism, to slow down the growth of revolutionary, communist forces in these countries, impose their control on the socialist and democratic parties and organisations in the regions, involve them in their own international organisations and instigate them to embark upon the road of social-reformist theory and practice, should certainly be viewed as negative. It is only natural that the revolutionary organisations and movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America regard the actions of the SI leaders with mistrust, because these actions impede their struggle for the radical transformation of society based on the principles of scientific socialism and the experience of countries that have already built socialism.

The peoples in the developing countries also realise that the appeals of the Socialist International to render economic aid to Third World countries and establish a new international economic order are largely prompted by the interests and considerations of the Western European social-democratic parties and governments. It stands to reason that this generates wariness towards the programmes and resolutions elaborated by the Socialist International and its major parties.

At the same time, the changes in the SI positions on the problems related to the national liberation movement and the development of newly-free countries are undoubtedly positive. They contribute to the growth and success of the liberation movement on these continents, the development of the workers' movement and of left-wing, democratic parties and organisa-

tions, and the spread of the ideas of democracy and socialism there. These changes encourage the emergent nations to struggle against fascist and racist regimes, feudal and monarchical forces, foreign monopolies and imperialist powers, primarily the United States. The positive changes which have taken place in the Socialist International's position open up new prospects for co-operation among the Social-Democrats, Communists, revolutionary Democrats and other left-wing, democratic forces, for the creation of a broad anti-imperialist front and joint struggle for national independence and social progress in countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

## THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE UNITY OF THE WORKERS' MOVEMENT

An analysis of the Socialist International's stance on the unity of the workers' movement deserves special attention in our days, first of all, because it will provide us with insight into the factors which for many of the postwar years have stood in the way of co-operation between social democratic and communist parties, and, secondly, because such an analysis will help to explain the significance of certain positive shifts in the positions of the Socialist International on this issue and the reasons for these shifts, and to establish whether there are prospects for developing contacts and uniting the actions of Socialists and Communists.

### 1. The Socialist International's Approach to the Co-operation of Workers' Parties

It has already been pointed out that the Socialist International was created by the leaders of Western European social-democracy on an anti-communist foundation. Right from the start the Socialist International has expressed hostility towards the communist parties and the socialist countries. Over a number of years the International has actively participated in various anti-communist campaigns and hampered the development of contacts and co-operation between the Socialists and Communists. The anti-communist position of the SI leaders was recorded in

the documents of its constituent congress, above all in its policy-making declaration on the Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism.

The Socialist International's ideologists directed their anti-communist efforts along three main lines. First of all, they sought to discredit Marxism-Leninism, the theory of the communist movement; secondly, they distorted the picture of socialist development in the USSR and other socialist countries; thirdly, they made efforts to smear the communist parties in the capitalist countries and undermine their influence among the masses.

The anti-communist line of the Socialist International and its member parties did enormous harm to the workers' and democratic movement by hampering the rallying of these movements' forces in the struggle for the interests of the working people. Thereby, the Socialist International objectively supported the more reactionary, right-wing forces in the capitalist countries.

The anti-communist orientation of the Social-Democrats undermined their credibility among the revolutionary-minded workers and engendered and maintained sectarian tendencies among the Communists. This naturally served to further complicate the relations between the Socialists and the Communists and created additional difficulties for the co-operation and unity of action of various contingents of the working class.

The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union largely helped to overcome these barriers. The report of the CPSU Central Committee to the Congress pointed out that many ills of the present-day world are rooted in the split in the working class, in the fact that its various contingents failed to form a united front. "At present, in our opinion," the report noted, "there are prospects for changing the situation. Life has put on the agenda a lot of problems which not only require the drawing together and co-operation of all workers' parties, but also create real possibilities for such cooperation."<sup>1</sup>

The CPSU's call for unity, supported by the communist parties of other countries, prompted the leaders of the Socialist

<sup>1</sup> *The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, February 11-25, 1956. Verbatim Report, Part I, Moscow, 1956, p. 22 (in Russian).*



International to discuss this issue at the SI Conference held in Zurich on March 2-4, 1956. The discussion led to the adoption of a resolution in which the leaders of the Socialist International declared their rejection of any form of co-operation with the communist parties.

It is noteworthy that the ruling circles in capitalist countries showed unusual interest in this conference of the Socialist International. The US Administration and official institutions even sent observers to the conference, who made efforts to influence the results of its work. The bourgeois press which normally gives little coverage to the Socialist International closely followed the debates in Zurich, with the American press leading the way. Suffice it to mention that comments on the session of the SI Council appeared in *The New York Times* on three occasions, with just as much coverage given by *The New York Herald Tribune*, another influential American newspaper. *The New York Times* reported with satisfaction that the socialist parties of 14 Western countries "retorted with a blunt 'no' to communism's proposal for political cooperation". Both newspapers published the text of the resolution adopted by the Socialist International Council in Zurich. Summing up the results of the conference, *The New York Times* pointed out that "the conference was the best in many years from the point of view of political achievements".<sup>1</sup> No further comment is required.

But while the bourgeoisie was satisfied with such a decision many Social-Democrats, including some of their prominent leaders, were clearly discontent with it. It is well known that even at the Zurich Conference some British, French and Swiss Socialists spoke in favour of co-operation with the Communists. For instance, Barbara Castle of the British Labour Party said that, in her opinion, the response of the Western Socialists to the Soviet move should be "positive". Pierre Commin, deputy General Secretary of the French Socialist Party, told the Conference that his party had accepted the invitation to visit the Soviet Union. The delegation of British Labourites, dissatisfied with the document submitted for the approval of the SI Council, proposed its own draft resolution.

Such critical remarks and proposals compelled the SI leaders

<sup>1</sup> *The New York Times*, March 5, 1956, p. 8.

to put the issue in question on the agenda of the SI Bureau meeting held in April 1956 so as to try and give a more detailed and substantiated statement of their position. The meeting resulted in the adoption of a new declaration, entitled "Socialism and Communism".

Unlike the resolution passed by the Zurich Conference, this document expressed the intention of the Socialist International to support such forms of co-operation with "communist governments" as would foster peaceful settlements of disputes. This decision was made under the pressure of those Social-Democrats who advocated the need for certain forms of co-operation with the Communists. However, in this declaration as well, the leaders of the Socialist International rejected all forms of *political* co-operation with the communist parties.<sup>1</sup>

The discussions in London, as well as those in Zurich, revealed the lack of consensus on the issue discussed. While the majority of the participants, who represented the parties in West Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, Sweden and some other countries, opposed any contacts with the communist parties and the socialist countries, the minority, composed of the representatives of the Belgian and the French parties and some representatives of the Labour Party, declared their willingness to co-operate with the Soviet Union, the CPSU and other communist parties.

The decisions taken by the Socialist International were commented on by some prominent members of social-democratic parties, such as the British historian and theorist George Coal, and the Chairman of the prewar Labour and Socialist International Camille Huysmans.

However, the opposition to the anti-communist line adopted by the Socialist International and its parties was not then strong and organised enough to have any noticeable impact on the positions of Western European social-democracy.

Nonetheless, the CPSU again called on the leaders of the Socialist International to unite the efforts of the Socialists and the Communists in the struggle for peace and social progress.

<sup>1</sup> *Yearbook of the International Socialist Labour Movement (Vol. 2, 1960-1961)*. Ed. by J. Braunthal, Lincoln-Praeger International Yearbook, London, 1960, p. 29.

A special letter addressed by the CPSU to the participants in the Sixth SI Congress held in July 1959 in Hamburg read: "We realise that there are differences between the socialist parties, on the one hand, and our comrades in many parts of the world, on the other, on certain important issues. Currently, however, all the contingents of the international working-class movement share a common historical task: to prevent a new war of extermination and repulse all attempts by reaction to launch an offensive. We welcome all sincere efforts on the part of those politicians who favour peace, democracy and socialism, and who seek the establishment of peace and social justice in the world and an end to the distress and suffering of mankind caused by imperialism.

"We do not think it appropriate to interfere in your internal affairs. We are of the opinion that socialism will eventually triumph in all countries in a way and form corresponding to a particular country, its national and historical specifics and traditions.

"We are addressing this letter to you because, despite the many years of struggle, humanity is still suffering from two evils: the threat of war and the evil of starvation."<sup>1</sup>

What was the reaction of the Socialist International's leadership to the letter from the CPSU? Not only was it not discussed but also kept secret from the delegates of the Sixth SI Congress. The SI leaders thereby demonstrated once again their unwillingness to give up their anti-communist positions.

The development of the 1960s showed that the course pursued by the Socialist International caused great harm to the workers' and democratic movements and had no prospects for the future. Reality demanded that the Social-Democrats re-evaluate many of their positions.

In the 1960s the events in the world and the struggle of the international workers' movement unfolded against the background of the further exacerbation of the general crisis of capitalism.

The communist parties sought, by taking advantage of the new possibilities, to unite all democratic forces in the struggle against imperialism and monopolies. As before, they placed

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, August 15, 1959.

special emphasis on establishing co-operation with the Socialists, regarding it, with good reason, as a basis for uniting all anti-imperialist and anti-monopoly forces.

Of great importance in this respect was the conference of the representatives of communist and workers' parties held in Moscow in 1960. The conference was attended by delegates from 81 parties from all continents. The resolutions of the conference provided a profound analysis of the situation in the world, clearly defined the tasks of the working class and all progressive forces and again called on the social-democratic parties to join hands in the struggle for a lasting peace, for the fulfilment of the basic demands of the workers, and for socialism. The Declaration of the Communist Parties read: "The vital interests of the working-class movement demand that the Communist and Social-Democratic parties take joint action on a national and international scale. . . . It is safe to say that *on overcoming the split in its ranks, on achieving unity of action of all its contingents, the working class of many capitalist countries could deliver a staggering blow to the policy of the ruling circles in the capitalist countries and make them stop preparing a new war, repel the offensive of monopoly capital, and have its daily vital and democratic demands met.*"<sup>1</sup> The Declaration stressed that the Communists were prepared to enter into discussion with Social-Democrats, being convinced that this was the best way to exchange views, ideas and experience for the purpose of eliminating deep-rooted prejudices, healing the split in the workers' ranks and establishing co-operation.

The appeal issued by the Moscow Conference met the vital interests of the working people and furthered their struggle for unity of actions. The constructive position formulated by the European communist parties at their conference held in Karlovy Vary in April 1967 served the same goal.

Addressing the latter conference, Leonid Brezhnev said: "In Western Europe the split in the working-class movement has not yet been healed: the working class is represented, along with its militant vanguard, the Communists, by the Social-Democrats. It has been noted more than once that the unity of Communists

<sup>1</sup> *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1963, p. 72.

and Socialists could bring about a sharp change in the entire political situation in Western Europe and erect a serious barrier in the path of the forces of reaction and aggression. For this reason the CPSU puts a great value on the policy of its fraternal parties aimed at overcoming the division of the working class."<sup>1</sup>

The Communists' persistent struggle for unity, their self-critical assessment of past mistakes, their sincere desire to heal the split in the workers' movement had an increasing influence on the Social-Democrats and served to promote among them a tendency to renounce anti-communism and wage a joint struggle for the democratic and socialist ideals of the working people.

The Japan Socialist Party was among the first socialist parties to reject the anti-communist dogmas preached by the leaders of the Socialist International. As early as January 1957, the Japan Socialist Party showed willingness to co-operate with the Communists. In October 1957, on the invitation by the CPSU Central Committee, the JSP sent its first delegation to the USSR. The delegation visited many Soviet towns and cities, undertakings and institutions and conducted talks with high-ranking officials of the CPSU Central Committee. As was pointed out in a statement by the Japanese Socialists, "the delegation became convinced that the ardent desire to avert war and live in peace is shared not only by the leaders but also by all segments of the population".<sup>2</sup>

In October 1959, right-wing members of the JSP who opposed co-operation with the Communists withdrew from the party and formed their own organisation, the Japan Democratic Socialist Party. The withdrawal of right-wing members from the JSP created more favourable conditions for co-operation with the Communists. In the 1960s, the unity of actions of the Socialists and the Communists was successfully cemented in the course of struggles against the Japanese-American "security treaty", against the conclusion of a treaty between Japan and South Korea, against the US aggression in Vietnam, for dismantling US military bases on the Japanese territory, and in defence of the vital interests of the workers.

<sup>1</sup> Leonid Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Vol. 2, p. 20 (in Russian).

<sup>2</sup> *Pravda*, October 13, 1957.

In June 1964, a second delegation of the Japan Socialist Party visited the Soviet Union. The delegation was headed by Tomomi Narita, the party's General Secretary.

In the early 1960s considerable shifts occurred in the positions of the French Socialist Party. The consolidation of Charles de Gaulle's personal power and the policy pursued by his regime provoked powerful opposition from the masses. The upsurge in the activity of the masses was accompanied by the establishment of de facto unity of action of the Communists and the Socialists. The Socialist Party leadership, critical of de Gaulle's regime, had to take into account the demand of the party rank and file and many party functionaries to establish contacts with the Communists. In November 1962, during the parliamentary elections, the Republicans, primarily the Communists and the Socialists, formed an alliance against de Gaulle's candidates in some of the districts. Guy Mollet, Jules Moch and some other leaders of the Socialist Party were elected to Parliament thanks to support from the Communists.

Many of the delegates of the Socialist Party Congress, which was held from May 30 to June 2, 1963, were compelled to recognise that the social-democratic philosophy of co-operating with the bourgeois parties and refusing to co-operate with the Communists was bankrupt and that it was advisable for the Party to return to class struggle. The right-wing of the French Socialist Party sought to prevent the party from turning towards co-operation with the Communists. As before, they sought an alliance with the bourgeois parties and a "class peace". However, due to bitter conflict within the party and the constructive position taken by the French Communists, the demands from the right were rejected and the Socialist Party, at its 56th Congress held from June 29 to July 2, 1967, reiterated the call for co-operation with the Communists. This created propitious conditions for conducting negotiations with the Communist Party on a common platform for struggle. The main principles of this platform were laid down in a declaration issued on February 21, 1968.

The positions of the Social-Democratic Party of Finland also underwent important changes. In the past, particularly under the leadership of Väinö Tanner, the Party held the most hawkish anti-communist and anti-Soviet stance among all European

social-democratic parties. However, the stance adopted by the party's right-wing leaders proved to be in opposition to the aspirations and demands of the masses, who gradually became convinced that friendship with the Soviet Union met Finland's vital interests. This became especially obvious during the 1962 presidential elections, when the SDPF, which took an anti-Soviet stand, suffered a severe setback. Internal strife within social-democratic ranks intensified sharply. The SDPF Congress of June 15-17, 1963 led to a reshuffle of the party leadership. The new leaders changed the party's policy in respect to the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and co-operation with the Communists. This co-operation was effected within trade unions and municipalities, in parliament and even, since the spring of 1966, within the government. Finland was the first country in Western Europe where, after a prolonged period of cold war, Communists and Socialists were joint participants in the government. The new policy of the Finnish Social-Democrats signalled a fundamentally new stage in the relations between the social-democratic and the communist parties.

The broad and all-round co-operation of the Finnish Social-Democrats with the Communist Party of Finland and the CPSU provoked the displeasure of the Socialist International. The SI leaders pressured the SDPF to return to its former anti-communist and anti-Soviet stand. However, the SDPF was resistant to all such pressure.

Although the leadership of other SI parties rejected united action with the Communists, many members and individual grass-roots organisations of these parties began co-operating with the Communists within the framework of various campaigns and movements. Thus, despite the growing anti-communist tendencies in the policy of the Italian Socialist Party, which in 1966 resulted in its merger with the Social-Democratic Party, many Socialists and their local organisations in various trade unions, towns and regions actively co-operated with the Communists. And in Spain and Portugal, Socialists and Communists joined forces in the struggle against fascism.

The fact that a number of articles appeared in the Socialist International journal directly warning of the threat to democratic forces posed by anti-communism attested to the emergence of new trends within the Socialist International. The author of

one of such articles, Max Diamant, wrote: "The fading spectre of Communism serves as a pretext and justification for all reactionary procedures."<sup>1</sup>

Even some right-wing representatives of the Socialist International began to call for the anti-communist stand of the social-democratic parties to be revised. Typical in this respect was the article by Z. Zaremba appearing at the end of 1967 in *Socialist International Information*. In the article, entitled "Anti-Communism and Socialism", Zaremba pointed out that "whenever a movement for the freedom of the working masses grows up, even when only a capitalist oligarchy feels itself endangered in some country ... the black flag of anti-Communism is raised". Zaremba concluded: "Such is the real situation, compelling us not only to oppose militant anti-Communism but to mobilise all possible strength in defence of democracy and social progress."<sup>2</sup>

Proposals for changing the stance of the Socialists in respect to the Communists began to be made even at official meetings of the leaders of the Socialist International and its member parties. Thus, in defiance of the posture of the SI leadership, some of the participants in the Eighth SI Congress, held in September 1963, who represented socialist parties from Japan, Finland, France and Canada, spoke in favour of establishing contacts and co-operation with the communist parties. Guy Mollet, for instance, suggested initiating a discussion between the Socialists and the Communists on the issues which divided them.<sup>3</sup> The Chairman of the New Democratic Party of Canada, T. C. Douglas, supported the idea of working out a new approach to the Communists. He pointed out that in Canada the real danger to progress came from the far right and not from the Communists. "Behind the screen of anti-Communism," he said, "almost every progressive measure, whether it be health insurance, or integration of schools, or the Test-Ban Treaty, is opposed by the far Right on the grounds that it will lead to Communism."<sup>4</sup>

Opposition to the outdated anti-communist line pursued by the Socialist International was also expressed at the conference

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 43, 1963, p. 635.

<sup>2</sup> *SI*, No. 20-21, 1967, pp. 191-92.

<sup>3</sup> See: *SI*, No. 1, 1964, p. 15.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

of the leaders of Western European social-democratic parties held in Rome on January 4-5, 1967 and at the meeting of the SI Council held in Zurich in October 1967. It is worth noting that Willy Brandt called for the adoption of a more moderate position. Speaking at the Zurich conference, Willy Brandt mentioned that the Soviet Union would "soon celebrate the 50th anniversary of its revolutionary founding" and suggested that the participants in the conference prepare a special message on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution as well as a special declaration addressed to the communist parties as a "contribution to understanding between East and West". The 50-year-long history of relations with the Communists, Brandt remarked, could not be rewritten, and "past battles belong to the past and cannot be repeated".<sup>1</sup>

Willy Brandt's proposal failed to gain the support of the Socialist International. However, the very fact that the proposal was advanced by one of the most outstanding figures in the Socialist International at the Conference of its Council attested to the increased recognition by Social-Democrats of the need for new approaches to the relations between the Socialists and the Communists.

Nonetheless, the SI leaders and the overwhelming majority of social-democratic parties continued to take an intransigent position on the communist parties and the socialist countries. They either rejected or passed over in silence the calls of the Communists for unity and made every effort to impede the development of co-operation between the communist and the social-democratic parties.

In the early 1960s, the right-wing Socialists took pains to undermine the influence of the ideas advanced by the 1960 Moscow Conference of the Communist Parties and to bar the way towards the unity of actions of the Social-Democrats and the Communists. The leaders of the International used to this end the new policy document which, as has already been mentioned, was prepared by the social-democratic ideologists as an anti-communist manifesto.

In the course of the debate on the new draft declaration at the 1961 SI Congress, the leaders of the International made

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 26, 1967, p. 247.

repeated attempts to prove that the Socialists and the Communists "had nothing in common" and that co-operation between them was therefore impossible.

Many anti-communist pronouncements were incorporated into the revised text of the declaration "The World Today—the Socialist Perspectives" adopted at the Oslo Conference of the Council. The section entitled "Socialism and the Communist Countries" is especially rich in anti-communist statements. The Socialist International's ideologists again assailed the socialist countries and above all the Soviet Union in a bid to justify their hostile attitude towards these countries and their rejection of the theory and practice of the communist parties.

Unable to deny the successes scored by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the development of the economy and culture and in raising the living standard of the population, they claimed that these successes were achieved at the cost of eliminating democratic freedoms. They distorted the picture of relations between the Soviet Union and the East European socialist countries, claiming that the Soviet Union "exploits" them.

The attitude of socialist parties to the Communists was a subject of debate at the Eighth SI Congress held in September 1963. The scanty information that was leaked to the press revealed discord among the leaders of the Socialist International and its member parties. The fact remains, however, that the overwhelming majority of the Congress's participants opposed co-operation with the communist parties. Erich Ollenhauer, addressing the Congress as the newly-elected Chairman of the Socialist International, called on the Social-Democrats not to harbor any illusions and be vigilant, while the far right even declared that it was time to start a general offensive against the Communists aimed at eliminating their movement. Even in the darkest days of the cold war the social-democratic leaders seldom took the liberty to make such malicious anti-communist statements.

Some of the speakers placed special emphasis on the differences emerging between China and the Soviet Union as well as between the Communist Party of China and other communist parties, urging to use these conflicts to fight the international communist movement. Eki Sone, Chairman of the Japan Democratic Socialist Party, for instance, did not even try to conceal

his satisfaction with the fact that these differences caused co-operation between the Socialists and Communists in Japan to discontinue.

In the years that followed the Socialist International leaders opposed any attempts on the part of social-democratic parties and their members to establish contacts and co-operation with the Communists. Illustrative in this respect was the reaction of the SI leadership to the visit of a French Socialist Party delegation, headed by Guy Mollet, to the Soviet Union. The delegation visited the USSR in October-November 1963 on the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

As a result of their talks, the leaders of the two parties declared that they largely agreed on the necessity of international detente. While recognising their serious differences on ideological problems, they stressed the importance of uniting the efforts of the working class, all working people, democratic and peace-loving forces in the struggle for peace, against all forms of aggression, and against the threat of a new world war.

The visit of the French delegation to Moscow was a topic of discussion at the meeting of the SI Bureau held in London in November 1963. According to a London *Times* correspondent, "German representatives ... expressed strong misgivings about the French socialists' action".<sup>1</sup> The delegation headed by Guy Mollet was criticised for having agreed to visit the USSR on the invitation of the Central Committee of the CPSU and not on that of the government, and especially for the fact that the communiqué issued after their talks recognised the usefulness of further contacts between the Socialists and the Communists. The criticism voiced by the SPD was supported by the delegation of the British Labour Party and by some other members of the SI Bureau.

The Socialist International's journal regularly published anti-communist articles and documents. These gave special emphasis to the difficulties experienced by the world socialist system and the international communist movement, and suggested playing on these difficulties in the interests of social-democracy and the Western states.

The desire of the right wing to saddle all SI parties with an

<sup>1</sup> *The Times*, November 25, 1963, p. 6.

intransigent anti-communist policy was reflected in a resolution adopted by the SI Bureau on October 4, 1965. The Bureau discussed the results of the trips of the Japan Socialist Party's delegations to the Soviet Union and China and the statements made by Japanese Socialists as quoted in various newspapers. In its resolution the SI Bureau recalled the anti-communist theses of the International's 1951 policy-making declaration, stressing that since the declaration was approved by all SI member parties, the observance of its principles was binding on all of them. "It follows from this Declaration," the Bureau stressed, "that it is not permissible for parties which are members of the Socialist International, any more than it is permissible for individual members of fraternal Socialist parties, to identify themselves with the policies, objectives and organisations of Communism." The Bureau insisted that "the Japan Socialist Party ... be guided, in common with other parties, by the principle enunciated above".<sup>2</sup>

Relations between the socialist and the communist parties were also considered by the Tenth SI Congress in 1966, although this issue was not included in the agenda. Just as at the previous congresses and meetings of the SI leaders, the majority of the delegates opposed co-operation with the communist parties. This was stated explicitly in the speeches of the then Chairman of the Socialist International, Bruno Pittermann, Willy Brandt, Pietro Nenni et al.

The majority of the participants in the Rome Conference of the leaders of the Western European social-democratic parties held in January 1967 also supported and justified the anti-communist line pursued by the Socialist International and its member parties.

The right-wing forces in the Socialist International became especially active during the new wave of anti-Sovietism and anti-communism that was launched by international reactionaries in connection with the events of 1968 in Czechoslovakia. They employed this campaign to intensify attacks on the Soviet Union and the communist parties. The August 1968 conference of the SI Council in Copenhagen, as well as the meetings of the SI Bureau and various conferences of social-democratic

<sup>2</sup> *SIJ*, No. 21, 1965, p. 227.



parties denounced the action taken by the five socialist countries and openly approved and supported the subversive activity of the opportunist, revisionist elements.

The Special Socialist International Working Party on "Developments in Communist Countries and Parties" formed early in 1968 proved to be very active in carrying out its task. It prepared a special report and a resolution which were submitted for the consideration of the 11th SI Congress held in June 1969. It is significant that the report had been discussed and approved by the SI Bureau. The report, read at the Congress by Karl Czernetz, gave a distorted picture of the state of affairs in the socialist countries and the communist parties. The main idea behind the report was to provide additional substantiation of the alleged impossibility of co-operation between the Socialists and the Communists. The basic principles of the report were incorporated in a resolution submitted for the approval of the Congress.<sup>1</sup>

The resolution completely disregarded the new world realities and those in the international workers' movement. It is therefore no accident that the resolution was opposed by many parties of the Socialist International. Although it was adopted by the Congress, it was nothing more than a truly Pyrrhic victory for the leaders of the Socialist International. It was approved by but nine out of the thirty-two full members of the International. The delegations of other parties were either absent when the vote was taken or abstained. As for the representatives of the Social-Democratic Party of Finland and the Japan Socialist Party, they openly refused to associate themselves with the resolution.

The final tally signalled a serious setback for the right-wing leaders. It showed that a large number of parties represented at the Congress did not wish to tie their hands by a resolution aimed at maintaining the cold war climate in the workers' movement. Although many parties were hesitant to openly oppose the anti-communist line of the International, they were nonetheless no longer willing to identify themselves with a policy that impeded the struggle waged by the democratic forces and objectively served the interests of reaction and imperialism.

<sup>1</sup> See: *SI*, No. 14, 1969, pp. 138, 148.

As Alan Day, editor of the Socialist International's journal, was subsequently to acknowledge, the anti-communist resolution adopted by the 11th SI Congress "did not conform to the actual facts of the political situation in Europe... Many Social-Democrats believed that the time has come to revise the old posture".<sup>1</sup>

## 2. The Two Conflicting Tendencies in the Socialist International

The late 1960s and early 1970s were marked by considerable changes in the world which had a great impact on social-democratic parties and the Socialist International: the anti-communist tendencies in their ranks waned, while the drive for dialogue and unity of actions with the communist parties and the socialist countries waxed.

Important changes, which were to have considerable impact on international social-democracy as a whole, appeared in the policy of the French Socialist Party. Over a number of years the French Socialist Party was the arena of bitter struggle between the advocates and the opponents of unity. In the late 1960s the advocates of the idea of co-operation among the working-class parties gained the upper hand. The congress of the French Socialist Party which was held in Issy-les-Moulineaux in July 1969, soon after the 11th SI Congress, declared capitalism the chief enemy and demanded the rejection of centrist combinations in favour of co-operation with the Communists. On the initiative of Guy Mollet and Alain Savary, the Congress resolved to launch a discussion with the Communist Party on the forms of struggle against the forces of capitalism, on the forms of transition to socialism and on the foundations of socialist society. In conformity with this resolution, the Socialists entered into negotiations with the French Communist Party on working out a platform for unity of actions, which resulted in the signing on June 27, 1972, of a joint governmental programme of the two parties.

The co-operation between the Communists and the Socialists on the basis of a common programme promoted the rallying of

<sup>1</sup> *Sozialdemokratische Korrespondenz*, No. 9, 1972.

left-wing forces in France, consolidated their positions and undermined those of the bourgeois parties.

Regardless of the Socialist International's interdiction, the Japan Socialist Party continued its policy of co-operation with the Communists. The extraordinary Congress of the JSP held in January 1969 censured the anti-communist course of the Socialist International and openly declared that the Japanese Socialists would work to promote a change in the Socialist International's stand on this issue. The resolution of the Congress stated: "Although the Socialist International, from its anti-Communist standpoint, is not necessarily playing a correct role, it is wrong to overlook that ... within the organisation there is a new trend of discontent with the position it has adhered to hitherto... The Party, firmly maintaining its basic position, will make efforts to correct and improve the present inclination of the Socialist International."<sup>1</sup> In its International Activity Plan adopted by the Congress the JSP proclaimed its intention to "expand its friendly relations with Socialist nations". Despite certain difficulties, the JSP maintained co-operation with the Communists in Japan which caused a shift in the political balance of forces in the country to the left. As a result, the left-wing forces scored major successes in the 1971-72 elections to local bodies of government.

The co-operation between the Social-Democratic and the Communist parties of Finland continued throughout the 1970s, including within the government. Although this line met with considerable difficulties, it served to disprove the claims of the right that the joint governmental activity of the Socialists and Communists was unfeasible.

In the same period, the Italian Socialist Party (ISP) showed greater inclination to co-operate with the Communists. The political bankruptcy of the left-of-centre government and the pressure from the left forced the leadership of the party to withdraw from the government and search for new ways of solving the problems Italy was faced with. This about-face in the positions of the ISP provoked the wrath of the right-wing Socialists, especially the leaders of the old Social-Democratic Party, who in June 1969 withdrew from the ISP and founded their own organisation. Upon the withdrawal of the Social-Democrats,

<sup>1</sup> *SI*, No. 6, 1969, p. 72.

the advocates of the working-class parties' unity acquired still greater weight in the Socialist Party. This was also fostered by the creation, following the regional elections of 1970, of bodies of local government headed by Communists and Socialists in three regions: Toscana, Emilia-Romagna and Umbria.

In the early 1970s, important changes occurred in the Luxembourg Socialist Labour Party. For years it had been dominated by the right, who pursued an overtly anti-communist policy. However, this policy was repudiated by the vast majority of the delegates at the LSLP Congress held in December 1970. The Congress elected a new leadership and adopted a resolution which called for the principles of co-operation with the Communists to be drafted both on the national and international scales. Discontent with this decision, the right wing withdrew from the party and created, in January 1972, their own organisation.

This period witnessed acute internal strife on the issue of co-operation with the Communists also within the Belgian Socialist Party. Such developments as the growing party crisis, the withdrawal of the left-wing Socialists from the Party, the waning authority of the Party among the population, including the trade unionists, compelled the leadership of the BSP headed by L. Collard to recognise the need for an alliance of progressive forces based on co-operation among the Socialists, Communists and other democratic organisations. The unity of the left was the focus of attention of the Party Congress held in December 1969. A resolution of the Congress underscored the importance of the unity of the left in the struggle for the establishment of genuine economic, social, cultural and political democracy.

The tendency towards co-operation with the Communists made itself felt even in those parties of the Socialist International (e.g. the socialist parties in Scandinavia, Great Britain, the FGR) whose leadership persisted in opposing the unity of actions with the communist parties. Many Socialists collaborated with the Communists at industrial enterprises and participated, side by side with the Communists, in the campaigns of solidarity with Vietnam, with the democratic forces in Chile, Portugal, Spain, with the peoples in Portuguese colonies fighting for their independence, as well as in the campaigns against the racist regimes in southern Africa.

Thus, despite the interdiction of the Socialist International and in defiance of the anti-communist resolution adopted by its 11th Congress, the drive for co-operation with the Communists was growing, and an increasing number of social-democratic parties were openly breaking off with the official policy of the Socialist International, making contacts with the communist parties and initiating various forms of united action with them.

Social-democracy's attitude to the Communists became the topic of vigorous debate in the Socialist International's bodies, too. In December 1970, this issue was discussed at a special workshop organised by the Socialist International. The debates revealed the existence of three stands on co-operation with the Communists. The representative of the Unified Italian Socialist Party (later renamed Democratic Socialist Party), was opposed to all forms of contact and co-operation with the communist parties. The representatives of the Italian Socialist Party and the Social-Democratic Party of Finland, on the contrary, supported the idea of co-operating with the Communists. The SPD representative Leo Bauer, who chaired the meeting, took a middle position. On the one hand, he denounced intransigent anti-communism. In this connection he recalled the words of Willy Brandt, who warned of anti-communism being used by the conservative forces as a "camouflage for the struggle against every kind of progress". On the other hand, he pointed out "that there was no basis for ideological coexistence between socialists and communists... Co-operation with communists had to be limited to specific fields and have a purely practical character."<sup>1</sup>

The results of the discussion were remarkable in that, firstly, the Socialist International was again forced to publicly discuss the relations between socialist and communist parties and, secondly, in that the parties which had a short while before pursued intransigent anti-communist policies began to consider the possibility of co-operating with the Communists on certain matters.

The Helsinki Conference of the SI Council (May 1971) devoted much attention to the above issue, although officially it was not included in the agenda. Among other things which prompted this issue to be brought before the conference was the

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1971, p. 23.

speech made by Leonid Brezhnev on May 14, 1971 in Tbilisi in which he again called on the leaders of the Socialist International to join efforts in the struggle for peace and the peaceful solution of acute international disputes. Brezhnev said: "Coming out in favour of international security and peace, against aggressive encroachments on the independence and legitimate rights of the peoples, we are prepared to co-operate with all those organisations and parties which in fact hold these goals as their own. Among other things, at the Congress we reaffirmed our positive attitude to the possible joint actions in the international arena with social-democratic parties."<sup>2</sup> Despite the fact that many of those who attended the Helsinki Conference took a negative stand on the prospects for co-operation with the Communists on a national scale, practically all the participants agreed that such co-operation was possible in the world arena, for example, in ensuring European security and in solving other urgent problems. The representatives of the Social-Democratic Party of Finland insisted on abandoning the outdated anti-communist posture. One of the leaders of the SDPF, Vainö Leskinen, stressing the importance of co-operation with the CPSU and the communist parties of other socialist countries, said: "We have proposed establishing contacts between the social democratic parties and the leading parties of the socialist countries in Eastern Europe. We repeat this proposal now. Would it not be a mistake of historic proportions if this opportunity were neglected at a moment when there is such a clear desire for constructive co-operation?"<sup>2</sup>

Such statements attested that the policy towards developing contacts and co-operation with the Communists was gaining increasing recognition among the Social-Democrats. The right-wing Socialists experienced mounting difficulties in defending their intransigent anti-communist line. This was made manifest at the meeting of the SI Bureau in November 1971. According to *Socialist Affairs*, the Bureau decided to convene a special SI Conference in order to formulate a response to the proposals advanced by the Communists. It was the general view of the

<sup>2</sup> Leonid Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Vol. 3, Politizdat, Moscow, 1973, p. 352 (in Russian).

<sup>2</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 5-6, 1971, p. 104.

Bureau that "the communist initiatives should be taken seriously and not dismissed as a propaganda manoeuvre".<sup>1</sup>

The decision taken by the Bureau testifies to a dramatic shift in the positions of the International's leadership: whereas only a short while before, at the 11th SI Congress held in 1969, the SI leaders resolutely denied the possibility of co-operating with the communist parties, now they were compelled to give serious thought to the Communists' proposals on such co-operation. Hans Janitschek, Secretary of the Socialist International, responding to a West German correspondent's question, said: "I have always been in favour of a dialogue. . . I know of a number of proposals, in particular for a dialogue between the Social-Democrats and the Communists. This is a highly important and useful idea, especially as regards the problem of European security and co-operation. It will give us a better idea of each other's views and is sure to dispel some surviving misunderstandings and mistrust."<sup>2</sup>

That discarding of the Socialist International's former approach to the Communists was a must came to be acknowledged by some other SI leaders. For this reason, the SI Bureau, after debating this issue once again in April 1972, was compelled to resolve that "member parties of the International should be free to decide their own bilateral relations with other parties".<sup>3</sup> This undoubtedly was one of the most important positive decisions taken by the Socialist International since its foundation. In fact, it signified the recognition of the bankruptcy of the Socialist International's former policy vis-à-vis the international communist movement. It was a major victory for the advocates of the unity of action of the workers' parties, ushering in a new stage in the development of the social-democratic and the international working-class movements, a stage marked by a declining cold war among the workers' parties and an extension of their co-operation.

After the Socialist International's ban on co-operation with communist parties was lifted, contacts between and joint actions of Socialists and Communists in the international arena intensified. This is evidenced by the increasing number of meetings

between representatives of social-democratic parties and the communist parties of the socialist countries, as well as by the joint participation of Socialists and Communists in various international conferences and other events. Thus, apart from Communists, the World Congress of Peace Forces held in Moscow in the autumn of 1973 was attended by the representatives of 49 socialist and social-democratic parties and movements. Many Socialists took part in the deliberations of the First and Second Assemblies of Public Forces for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The socialist parties of Belgium, Italy and France, the Social-Democratic Party of Finland and the British Labour Party sent their official representatives to the Second Assembly held in 1975.

Contacts between the social-democratic parties of a number of countries and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union expanded. A delegation of French Socialists headed by François Mitterrand made an official visit to Moscow in 1975, followed by a delegation of Spanish Socialists, headed by Felipe González, in December 1977, and a delegation of the leaders of the Norwegian Labour Party in May 1979. Many Social-Democrats were present in Moscow for the 60th anniversary celebration of the October Revolution in 1977. In turn, CPSU delegations went to foreign countries to meet with the leaders of social-democratic parties, including the British Labour Party (in October 1976), the Social-Democratic Party of Finland (in March 1978), and the Belgian Socialist Party (in September 1978). In the 1970s, the representatives of the CPSU for the first time attended the socialist congresses in Belgium (1974), Great Britain (1977) and France (1979).

The outcome of some of the conferences of the leaders of social-democratic parties also testified to positive shifts occurring in the Socialist International and its member parties. The leaders of the socialist parties of France, Italy, Belgium, Spain, Greece and Portugal, who gathered in May 1975 in France, all supported co-operation with the Communists. Commenting on the results of the discussion, François Mitterrand said that there was "solid cement" among those present, consisting of "the choice of socialism, the choice of uniting the peoples' forces with the political parties representing the workers and the masses".<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in: *The New York Times*, May 26, 1975, p. 3.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 12, 1971, p. 221.

<sup>2</sup> *New Times*, No. 23, June 1972, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 5, 1972, p. 94.

On January 18-19, 1976, the leaders of 18 socialist and social-democratic parties met in Helsingør. According to press reports, some of the conference participants supported co-operation with the Communists in spite of the efforts of opponents of the policy of unity. Their stand was officially supported by the subsequent conference of the representatives of socialist parties held in Paris on January 24-25 and attended by the leaders of the Socialists in France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Luxemburg and Greece.

It would be certainly misleading to say that all the social-democratic leaders who participated in the Paris Conference were already prepared to unconditionally embark upon the road towards an honest and stable alliance with the Communists. Nonetheless, there is no doubt that the Conference highlighted positive shifts in the positions of a number of socialist parties. François Mitterrand, for instance, made a statement to the effect that the alliance of the left-wing forces was a necessary stage in the transition to a truly democratic, and consequently, to a socialist society. Until the wage-earners had united, he said, the capitalist class in power would employ society in its own interests. Those who believe that the French Socialist Party could single-handedly resolve all problems "indulge in sectarianism negating the historical reality".<sup>1</sup>

Even those members of the Socialist International who opposed co-operating with the Communists in their own countries recognised the need for such co-operation in some other countries. Thus, Willy Brandt conceded that the restoration of democracy in Chile would be achieved when all democratic forces united in order to overthrow the military dictatorship. Proceeding from this premise, the SI leadership organised a Conference on Future Perspectives for Chile in Amsterdam in 1977. All the parties of the Popular Unity Front, including the Communist Party, were invited to the Conference. Commenting on this event, Bernt Carlsson observed: "This was the first occasion since 1922 that a meeting of our International was attended also by representatives of a Communist party."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See: R. Löwenthal (Ed.), *Demokratischer Sozialismus in den achtziger Jahren*, Cologne, 1979, pp. 224, 227.

<sup>2</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1979, p. 14.

The new tendencies in the activity of the social-democratic parties and the Socialist International vividly manifested themselves in their positive response to the initiatives advanced by the USSR and other socialist countries on matters related to the all-European conference and other complex and important problems of safeguarding peace, consolidating detente and achieving disarmament.

Commenting on the relations between the social-democratic and communist parties, the leader of Finnish Social-Democrats, Kalevi Sorsa told the 13th SI Congress that in the past few years dialogue between the Social-Democrats and Communists had been developing successfully. He remarked that the Finnish Social-Democratic Party had discussed various problems, including those related to safeguarding peace, with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the ruling parties of other Eastern European countries. "We can summarize our report of these discussions," he said, "by saying that they have been of benefit and have vindicated the initial advances that we made ten years ago."<sup>1</sup> Sorsa commented on the positive effect of the Berlin Conference of the Communist Parties of Europe (1976) and called upon his colleagues in the Socialist International to develop contacts and co-operation with the Communists.

An important landmark in the history of the Socialist International was its Disarmament Conference held in Helsinki in April 1978. It was remarkable that for the first time in the International's history its social-democratic leadership invited a Soviet representative to attend its conference. Speaking before the Conference, Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, outlined the positions of the CPSU and the Soviet state on the problem of disarmament.

The Socialist International journal gave an overall positive assessment to the participation of the CPSU delegation in the Conference and to the initiatives it advanced. The author of the article, Reimund Seidelman of the SPD, wrote: "...The offer of the USSR or rather of the Soviet Communist Party has opened up an important perspective which the Socialist International member organisations cannot avoid..."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1, 1977, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 4, 1978, p. 99.

Thus, the numerous developments of the 1970s show that not only individual social-democratic parties but the Socialist International itself began to recognise the need for contacts and certain forms of co-operation with the Communists in solving the many urgent problems facing the workers' movement, primarily, the problem of ensuring world peace and international security.

The emergence within social-democratic ranks of a tendency towards contacts and co-operation with the communist parties is undoubtedly of great importance. The further growth of this tendency can affect the alignment of forces in individual countries and in the world arena. In this connection the question arises as to whether this tendency is really meaningful and promising or whether it is merely a transient phenomenon in the life of social-democracy.

Upon analysis, the changes in the positions of individual social-democratic parties and their International turn out to be as a whole not accidental shifts caused by temporary, transient factors. They are engendered by complex and profound changes in the objective conditions of the development of the workers' and the social-democratic movements in the 1970s.

The factors that caused the positive changes in the positions of social-democracy can be divided roughly into three main groups: (1) the exacerbation of economic and social contradictions and the intensification of the class struggle in the capitalist countries; (2) the important switch from cold war to peaceful coexistence in international relations and the relaxation of international tensions; (3) the persistent efforts of the communist parties towards rallying all democratic forces.

These factors merit a more detailed analysis.

The exacerbation of economic and social contradictions, recession, the growing rate of unemployment, the feeling of insecurity—all this had an enormous impact on the masses in capitalist countries. Many workers began to shake off the illusions which for many years had been instilled in their minds by the bourgeois ideologists and social-democratic leaders. Reality itself proved that the workers would be able to satisfy their demands and defend their interests only through struggle. For this struggle to be successful, the unity of the working class and the joint action of workers of different political orientations are vital. Up against this, many blue- and white-collar workers began to

realise that the onslaught of the monopolies could be repelled only by the united action of the workers. This realisation promoted efforts towards healing the split in the trade-union movement, towards co-operation among the trade unions of different political orientations. This was especially obvious in Finland, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal and Japan. In some of the countries where social-democratic leaders opposed co-operating with the Communists (e.g. in Britain and the FRG), the ban on communist participation in the reformist trade unions was partially lifted.

The 1970s were also marked by substantial changes in the international trade-union movement: the tendency towards co-operation among the trade unions of various political orientations was appreciably reinforced. Of great importance for the international working-class movement was the meeting of the leaders of the trade-union centres of European countries (except Greece, Spain and Portugal) which took place on January 19, 1974 in Geneva. It was the first meeting since 1949 of the leaders of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the International Labour Conference and independent trade unions. The first European trade-union summit showed that the co-operation of trade unions of various orientations is not only desirable but quite feasible. It goes without saying that these changes in the European trade-union movement helped grease the way for positive shifts in social-democratic parties too.

During this same period the Social-Democrats became increasingly critical of and disappointed with the policies of the social-democratic parties and demanded more decisive measures to curb the monopolies. Many workers, among them members of social-democratic parties and trade unions, came to realise that their goals could be attained only through working out a new strategy of struggle grounded in the unity of all workers, in the alliance of the left-wing forces and close co-operation among the workers' parties, and not by maintaining class peace and co-operation with bourgeois parties.

As a result of growing economic and social difficulties, intensified class struggle and a certain shift to the left in the alignment of political forces, the right-wing forces became more active too, and various neo-fascist groups and trends emerged. This



was bound to have an effect on the social democratic parties. The point is that certain circles of monopoly bourgeoisie rely on the neo-fascist and other reactionary forces in the struggle against the workers' and democratic movements. It is only natural that expanded activity of the right-wing, pro-fascist forces in Italy, Belgium, Denmark, the FRG and elsewhere compels the Social-Democrats and their leaders to look for ways and means of preventing the resurrection of the past. They remember only too well that the major causes of the fascists coming to power in Germany and several other countries in the 1930s included the split in the workers' movement, the lack of unity among the left and hostility between the Social-Democrats and the Communists.

In September 1979, Dieter Scholz, leader of the West Berlin Young Socialists Organisation, declared: "We all know that anti-communism is one of the fundamental elements of the fascist ideology. And we all know that anti-communism was an important means for preparing the fascist attack on the Soviet Union. Today we see that anti-communism is once again being elevated to the rank of a state doctrine... The maintenance of anti-communism as a state doctrine prevents the creation of long-term prospects for peace and peaceful co-operation in Central Europe. That is why the fight against fascism and war now also means a fight against the anti-communist ideology."<sup>1</sup>

The crisis of the bourgeois political system and the increased political instability in a number of Western European countries has engendered terrorism and has invigorated the activity of all kinds of extremist organisations and groups which often operate under leftist slogans and declarations (as is the case in Italy, Spain, Portugal and some other countries). The struggle against these organisations and movements opens up new possibilities for co-operation between the Communists and the Socialists. The principled stand of the communist parties in defence of democratic freedoms and institutions is conducive to the elimination of mutual hostility and mistrust between Communists and Socialists, to their drawing together and their unity of action.

The September 1970 victory gained by the Popular Unity Front in Chile which united under a single banner Socialists,

<sup>1</sup> *World Marxist Review*, No. 6, 1980, p. 75.

Radicals and Communists, made a great impression on international, and especially Western European, social-democracy. The Front served as an example of the effective unity of action of Socialists and Communists and demonstrated the great importance of such unity for the victory of the left at elections and for effecting far-reaching social and economic transformations in the interest of the working people.

The unity of action of Communists and Socialists in a number of countries and their successful joint struggle disproved various theoretical arguments of the right-wing Socialists claiming that such unity was unfeasible, that it could only do harm to the democratic forces and have a pernicious effect on the activity of the social-democratic parties. However, as was proved in France, Chile, Japan, Finland, Italy and a number of other countries, unity of action is of benefit not only for Communists but for Socialists as well.<sup>1</sup>

International detente was a particularly important factor responsible for the positive shifts in the social-democratic ranks. The cold war was the major obstacle barring the way towards establishing contacts and the unity of actions of social-democratic and communist parties. During the cold war the Social-Democrats, intimidated by the alleged threat of Soviet aggression, concentrated their efforts on reaching an alliance with the bourgeois parties in order to set up a "national front" for "saving the nation". Detente and the peaceful policy pursued by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries shattered the anti-Soviet and anti-communist myths engendered by the cold war. Increasing numbers of Social-Democrats and their leaders began to realise that alleged Soviet aggression was a pure invention and that it was not the Communists but the forces of reaction and imperialism that were the enemies of social-democracy.

The many years of active struggle waged by the communist parties for uniting the actions of the working class also had a great impact on the social-democratic posture. The Communists helped bring down the fence, which had for many years sepa-

<sup>1</sup> For instance, in 1973 the leader of the French Socialist Party, François Mitterrand, observed that "the Socialist Party, regenerated and renewed, has never felt as strongly as at the present, thanks to the union of the left and its common programme". (*Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1973, p. 9.)

rated the communist and the social-democratic parties, by employing a creative approach to the problems of class struggle in modern conditions and making constructive proposals for joint action, and not merely by advancing the slogan of unity.

Cognisant of the important changes reverberating throughout the world and the new prospects which unfolded before the international workers' and communist movements, the communist parties adopted a new approach to a number of questions on which they had once had irreconcilable differences with the Socialists. Among them were the possibility for peaceful transition to socialism, the attitude to bourgeois democracy and reforms under capitalism, and the possibility of preventing a new world war. The unity of actions of Communists and Socialists was also helped along by the vigorous efforts of the communist parties to map out programmes for struggle against monopolies and programmes for structural reforms which were in harmony with many of the social-democratic proposals on limiting the omnipotence of monopolies and defending the workers' interests.

Taking into consideration the new conditions of class struggle, the communist parties persistently sought to expand contacts and co-operation with social-democratic parties. Their efforts were crowned with particular success in those capitalist countries (France, Italy, Finland, Spain and Japan) where the Communists have strong roots among the working class. The communist parties in socialist countries have also worked tirelessly towards this goal.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union provided an example of enterprising and purposeful activity. The principled and, at the same time, flexible approach adopted by the CPSU enabled it to establish contacts with the social-democratic parties in a number of countries. Between 1971 and 1975, the CPSU was host to fifteen delegations of various socialist parties. This period was marked by the successful development of the CPSU's ties with the socialist parties in Japan, Belgium, Finland, France, Britain and some other countries. Commenting on the importance of these contacts, the delegations of the CPSU and the Belgian Socialist Party in their joint communiqué issued on November 9, 1972 pointed out: "In the course of their talks the delegations came to the conclusion that to promote the cause of peace, democracy and social progress, a positive approach should

be taken to actions aimed at uniting the efforts of communist and socialist parties and other progressive and democratic forces."<sup>1</sup>

The meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Brezhnev and the members of the SI Study Group on Disarmament which took place on October 1, 1979 provided fresh evidence of the Soviet Communist Party's willingness to develop contacts with the social-democratic parties and the Socialist International. It is important to stress that this was the first ever official visit of a Socialist International delegation to the Soviet Union to meet with the leaders of the CPSU. The SI delegation was composed of the Chairman of the Social-Democratic Party of Finland, Kalevi Sorsa, the General Secretary of the Socialist International, Bernt Carlsson, and other prominent figures in the socialist or social-democratic parties of France, the FRG, Spain, Austria, the Netherlands, Senegal and Venezuela.

During the talks Leonid Brezhnev stressed that the CPSU would continue to support the idea of businesslike contacts with the Socialists and Social-Democrats. He said: "We appreciate the results achieved and are prepared to go on developing this kind of relations. The important thing is that we have common tasks before us that are vitally important for the destinies of all nations."<sup>2</sup>

Thus, the tendency towards co-operation between the Social-Democrats and the Communists was generated by deep-rooted political, economic and social factors, signalling not a temporary phenomenon but a long-term trend in the development of the international workers' movement.

### 3. Difficulties for Achieving Unity of Action and the Communist Policy on the Issue

While noting the positive shifts in the social-democratic policy and the reasons behind them one cannot overlook the many negative aspects in the positions taken by the Socialist International and its parties which impede the efforts towards unity of actions

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, April 27, 1972.

<sup>2</sup> *Pravda*, October 2, 1979.

of the Communists and Social-Democrats. It should be pointed out that the anti-communist activity of the right-wing Socialists did not cease when the Socialist International lifted the ban on co-operation with the communist parties. More, faced by a situation where gravitation towards co-operation was growing and the possibilities for it became more realistic, many right-wing Social-Democrats made vigorous efforts in order to nip this tendency in the bud. Ian Mikardo, a prominent figure in the British Labour Party, commenting on the results of the 13th SI Congress, wrote: "A few of the social democrats are less interested in furthering social democracy than in combating communism."<sup>1</sup>

The leaders of the social-democratic parties of the FRG, Austria, Sweden and some other countries not only were against joint actions with the communist parties in their countries, but also tried to pressure the SI member parties already co-operating with the Communists into rejecting this course.

The views of the right-wing Socialists had a great impact on the Socialist International's positions on the struggle unfolding in such countries as France, Italy, Spain and Portugal. In the 1970s the situation in these countries was ripe for co-operation between the Socialists and Communists, for a left victory in parliamentary elections, and for the creation of governments headed by the representatives of workers' parties. However, the Socialist International, while proclaiming its support to the workers' and democratic movement, opposed the participation of Communists in the governments of these countries.

This can be exemplified in particular by the policy of the Socialist International vis-à-vis Portugal during an acute political crisis brought about by the withdrawal of Socialists from the government in the summer of 1975. The SI Bureau in its statement on this crisis openly acknowledged that the International's objective was not only to prevent the strengthening of the right-wing, pro-fascist forces in the country but also to hamper the consolidation of the left-wing, communist forces.<sup>2</sup>

While in a number of countries contacts between the workers' organisations and the unity of action were growing, the right wing

<sup>1</sup> *Tribune*, December 10, 1976, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> See: *Socialist Affairs*, No. 4, 1975, p. 79.

of the Socialist International sought to use this co-operation to the detriment of the Communists. More to the point, in certain countries, such as France, Finland and Italy, the Socialists were trying to overcome the difficulties they were confronted with and to enhance their influence among the masses with the help and at the expense of the communist parties. Describing the position of the right-wing Socialists on this issue, the Socialist International journal wrote that co-operation with the Communists was possible only provided it led to the consolidation of "democratic", i.e., social-democratic forces.<sup>3</sup>

At the same time, the Social-Democrats in many countries made great efforts to force Communists into serious ideological and political concessions by playing on their desire for co-operation. The leaders of the socialist parties unequivocally gave to understand that they would be ready to co-operate with the communist parties provided the latter refused to support the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and rejected some of their ideological tenets which were unacceptable to the Social-Democrats, such as the theory of socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarian internationalism, and Leninism.

In other words they sought to push the Communists down the road of social-democratic degeneration.

The right-wing leaders of the Socialist International continued to openly interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist countries on the plea of defending human rights. For instance, the SI Bureau, at its meeting held on March 30, 1977, approved a special statement on the situation in Czechoslovakia which vindicated the subversive activities of the authors of the so-called Charter 77 manifesto. A similar statement on the situation in Poland adopted by the SI Presidium on December 29, 1981 is another example of such interference. It goes without saying that statements of this kind do not help the overcoming of mistrust between the social-democratic and the communist parties and organisations.

In a bid to weaken the influence of the Communists throughout the world, the right-wing leaders of the Socialist International also make the most of the difficulties and differences that have occurred in the international communist movement.

<sup>3</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1976, p. 17.

Thus, the analysis shows that despite certain positive shifts, the anti-communist tendencies are still very strong in the Socialist International and its member parties and one can hardly expect them to be overcome easily and at an early date.

The anti-communist orientation of the Social-Democrats has long-standing traditions and deep roots. Serious political, ideological, social and economic causes that foment anti-communist sentiment in social-democratic ranks still persist.

The bourgeoisie and its mass media have an enormous impact upon social-democracy. The bourgeoisie is fearful of the unity of the working-class movement and is doing its utmost not to let the mutual hostility and mistrust between the Socialists and the Communists be overcome. It skilfully plays upon the anti-communist prejudices in social-democratic ranks in order to impede contacts between and the unity of action of the communist and the socialist parties. Distorting the true history of the socialist revolutions and socialist development in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the bourgeois ideologists brainwash the working people by exaggerating the hardships involved in the revolution, the horrors of the civil war, economic disruption, poverty, starvation and privation of the masses which are allegedly inevitable in the wake of "the communist revolution".

The petty-bourgeois, middle-class elements, whose proportion in social-democratic membership is growing and who, as a rule, have an important role to play in the governing bodies of social-democratic parties, have a negative impact upon social-democracy.

In its effort to bring pressure to bear upon social-democracy, the bourgeoisie makes wide use of the co-operation between the bourgeois and the social-democratic parties in the parliaments and governments of many capitalist countries. Playing on the interest of the Social-Democrats in such co-operation the bourgeoisie saddles them with its anti-communist sentiments and views.

Of similarly negative effect is the years-long alliance of social-democracy with the US ruling circles in the international arena. "Atlantic solidarity", which is in reality an anti-Soviet policy, makes the Social-Democrats associate themselves with the course of the Western powers aimed at perpetuating anti-Soviet and anti-communist views and tendencies in the social-democratic parties and the Socialist International.

It would be unjust to disregard the fact that closer co-operation between Socialists and Communists is also hampered by their radically different approaches to present-day capitalism, socialism and the ways of transforming capitalist society. Apart from real differences in ideological and political positions there are many artificial ones, created by right-wing, anti-communist elements. The latter wittingly distort the positions of the Communists and ascribe to them views and ideas which the Communists have never adhered to or long ago rejected. Thus, they often resort to allegations that Communists are enemies of democracy since they advocate the need, in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, for replacing the power of the bourgeoisie and reactionaries by the power of the working class allied with other working people, i.e., the power described by the founders of scientific socialism as the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the communist perception, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not the rejection of democracy but, on the contrary, a new type of democracy, more advanced than the one existing in the capitalist countries. It is well known that the democratic institutions, as well as the so-called democratic, legal state are employed by Big Business, the capitalist monopolies, to safeguard their own mercenary interests, wealth and privileges, to protect the existing system of ownership and economic relations which engender social inequality and the exploitation of man by man. Only the power of the workers, the Communists hold, can put an end to the unfair economic and political system, only this power can ensure true democracy for the working people and in the interests of the working people, and liberate them from the oppression and the arbitrary rule of Big Business.

While the true, principled positions of the Communists are ignored, such views are ascribed to them which make them out as enemies of democracy in general.

Thus, the German social-democratic authors Gerhard Wuthe and Heinz Junker write: "Political discussion between proponents of different points of view is apparently possible. However, until the official communist policy persists in its undemocratic positions, there can be no rapprochement between the Communists and the democratic Socialists."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Demokratische Gesellschaft. Konsensus und Konflikt*, Part 1, Munich-Vienna, 1975, p. 159.

The social-democratic parties make efforts to counteract the consolidation of the communist parties' positions among the working class and other strata of the population. They seek to perpetuate their own positions in those countries where they are at the helm of the workers' and democratic movements and to broaden their influence in those countries where they are not as strong.

The same pattern of social-democratic behaviour can be observed in the developing countries, where the Socialist International and its member parties seek to counteract the growing influence of the Communists.

Various international conflicts in the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Latin America have complicated the relations between social-democratic and communist parties. By aggravating relations between states, including those between states belonging to the two opposed systems, they contribute to the revival of sentiments and views typical of the cold war days and prevent the Social Democrats from discarding old anti-communist dogmas. Any aggravation of the international situation is used by the right-wing Social-Democrats to stem the tendency towards the unity of action of the workers' parties and organisations, and to reiterate their old allegations that co-operation between the Socialists and the Communists is unfeasible.

Lastly, it should be noted that certain sectarian tendencies which still occur among the Communists also hamper the overcoming of hostility and mistrust between the Social-Democrats and the Communists.

The foregoing shows that there are numerous and serious factors promoting anti-communist views and prejudices among social-democracy. Therefore, one should take a sober view of things without cherishing illusions that these factors can be easily removed and that the social-democratic parties will readily reject their anti-communist views and join in the active struggle waged by the Communists. The situation is much more complicated and the problems to be solved are much more difficult.

This is borne out, for instance, by the fact that in late 1970s and early 1980s the social-democratic parties' tendency towards developing contacts and co-operation with the Communists started to subside while the anti-communist sentiments in the Socialist International and some of its member parties mounted.

Thus, the relations between the French Socialist and Communist parties sharply deteriorated and the antagonisms between them became more acute. This led to the virtual collapse of their alliance which had been based on the joint governmental programme of 1972. Infighting considerably weakened the left and was one of the reasons behind its defeat in the 1978 elections. The French example shows that the problem is not only to overcome the long-standing mistrust and hostility in the ranks of the workers' movement and promote co-operation between the Socialists and the Communists, but also to safeguard their alliance and turn it into a stable and effective factor of social development.

In the late 1970s, the new leadership of the Italian Socialist Party, headed by Bettino Craxi, took, to the detriment of the vital interests of the Italian working people, a rigid anti-communist stand. The Italian socialist leaders not only refused to expand the area of co-operation with the Communists, including in the government, but also started to bar the way towards the unity of action in such traditional areas as trade unions, municipalities and regional juntas.

A certain shift to the right was also displayed by the activity of the Japan Socialist Party. It was now dominated by the forces opposing co-operation with the Japanese Communist Party. Turning a blind eye to the positive results of this co-operation, the leaders of the Socialist Party opted for a new bloc which would include the Komeito Party and the Democratic Socialist Party and excluded communist participation.

The Socialist Party of Portugal pursued an anti-unity policy. On the eve of the October 1980 elections, the Socialist Party rejected the proposal of the Communist Party to form a united bloc to combat the right-wing bourgeois forces. The split in the ranks of the left played into the hands of the right and promoted their victory at the elections.

Anti-communist tendencies also persisted in many other member parties of the Socialist International. The leadership of some parties blocked all attempts on the part of individual Social-Democrats and social-democratic organisations to enter into some form of co-operation with the Communists. Thus, in 1977, the SPD excluded from its ranks K. Benneter, head of the Young Socialists organisation, for his advocating the idea that co-operation

with the Communists in the struggle for peace and disarmament was possible. In 1978, the SPD expelled the Chairman of the Socialist Union of Higher School Students, Jansen.

Additional difficulties arose in the way of dialogue, contacts and co-operation between the Socialists and the Communists in connection with the developments in Poland. The right wing of the Socialist International and its member parties gave full play to these developments to intensify their anti-communist attacks.

These and other developments serve to illustrate the complexity of the relations between the Socialists and the Communists and the seriousness of the obstacles barring the way towards overcoming mutual mistrust and, at times, overt hostility between them.

Yet, no matter how complicated the problem and how great the difficulties preventing its solution, it would be hardly proper to conclude that it is altogether impossible to heal the split and calm the internal strife within the international workers' movement.

Today, despite the profound differences between the Communists and the Socialists, they have some common or similar positions to enable them to co-operate on a wide range of issues, both in individual countries and in the international arena.

It should be noted that this is recognised even by those parties and leaders who a short while ago opposed the idea of co-operation. Typical in this respect is the pamphlet *The Dilemma of Eurocommunism* published in 1980 by the British Labour Party. Its authors recognise that the Social-Democrats and the Communists share quite a number of views and that it is vital to heal the "great split" that occurred in the international workers' movement between 1919 and 1921.

To judge from experience, in the current context co-operation between the Social-Democrats and the Communists can be maintained in various forms and at various levels, including co-operation among political parties (for instance, in France), co-operation among district and regional organisations (for instance, in Italy), and co-operation between party cells in the enterprises, communities, trade unions and other organisations. This last form of co-operation can be observed in many countries, including those whose social-democratic party leaders officially prohibit

their party members and organisations co-operation with the Communists.

Co-operation between the Socialists and the Communists can be maintained, first of all, in such large workers' organisations as trade unions, as well as in other public organisations, including youth, women's and co-operative organisations, and in movements organised by the environmentalists, the champions of peace and disarmament, etc.

The Social-Democrats and the Communists also co-operate in municipal bodies. In a number of countries, such as France, Spain, Italy, Finland and Japan, this form of co-operation has acquired great importance. It takes place also in some other countries where parties lack unity at the national level, for instance, in Holland, Switzerland, Luxembourg and Belgium. In Spain, as a result of the 1979 elections to local bodies, Socialists and Communists came to dominate the municipalities in which live more than 70 per cent of the country's population.

The differences in the background against which the working-class movement unfolds in capitalist countries, the different correlation of political and class forces in these countries and the historical and national specifics of the class struggle determine the differences, at times substantial, in the concrete platforms of united action which can provide a basis for co-operation among various parties and trends in the working-class movement. It is obvious that a broad programme of co-operation which is practicable, for instance, in France would not work in some other countries which lack the necessary objective and subjective conditions for such co-operation.

The programme of struggle for the satisfaction of the immediate demands of the workers (such as higher wages, secure jobs, a shorter working day, better working and housing conditions, etc.) and for democratic rights and freedoms can obviously provide an easily and universally acceptable basis for co-operation. Experience shows that the Socialists and the Communists actually co-operate, often in defiance of bans imposed by social-democratic leaders, in the struggle for satisfaction of workers' demands.

Of overriding importance in the current context is the struggle for implementing a programme of broad democratic reforms, such as nationalising individual monopolies and industries, install-



ing democratic control over the nationalised enterprises, effecting a reform of the tax and public investment systems, a reform of public education, health care, social welfare, etc. France is an example of such co-operation today. The unity of left-wing forces secured for them a victory at the 1981 presidential and parliamentary elections. It was for the first time in the history of France that a Socialist—François Mitterrand—was elected President, and a socialist government, in which Communists have several seats, was formed.<sup>1</sup> The victory of the left-wing forces and their co-operation in the parliament and the government created propitious conditions for passing important legislation and effecting major reforms in the interests of the working people. Under the new legislation, a number of major monopolies and 26 private banks have been nationalised. This considerably limits the sphere of action of Big Business and provides better opportunities for the state to control the country's economy. A special tax has been imposed on the income of the highest-paid groups of the population. Deductions from the profits of oil monopolies and banks have been increased. The new law on amnesty includes a clause on restoring rights to all trade-union activists illegally dismissed from their jobs for organising strikes and other protest campaigns in recent years. The State Security Court has been dissolved. The new law on decentralisation has broadened the rights of local self-government bodies and restricted those of the prefects appointed by the government. The retirement age has been lowered to 60. Measures have been mapped out to gradually reduce the working week and efforts are being taken to combat unemployment.

These actions by President Mitterrand and the French government signalled a new stage in the development of the socialist movement not only in France but throughout Western Europe.

Analysing the French experience, every true Socialist and Social-Democrat is bound to realise that in order to reach the socialist goals they proclaim it is essential to radically change the alignment of political and class forces in society. It stands to

<sup>1</sup> It is a well known fact that the US Administration tried to prevent the French from incorporating Communists into the new government. The Department of State even took the liberty of officially warning France against it. However, US pressure was repulsed by President Mitterrand.

reason that socialist goals cannot be achieved in alliance with the bourgeois parties and on the basis of class peace and social partnership. It is imperative to break off with the bourgeois forces and parties and establish a new bloc of social and political forces, an alliance involving Communists and other members of the left wing. Only a union of left-wing forces can isolate and weaken the forces of the bourgeoisie and reaction and make genuine anti-capitalist transformations possible.

It is certainly not easy for many Social-Democrats to decide to break off with the bourgeois forces and parties and establish durable co-operation with the Communists and other members of the left wing. They have become too much accustomed to the theory and practice of class peace, many of them gaining no small personal benefit from it.

But if Social-Democrats do wish to build a socialist society (and not only talk about it), sooner or later they will have to accept the indisputable truth which has already been recognised by the French Socialists: the advance towards socialism is impossible without dissociation from the bourgeois reactionary forces, without a strong front of left-wing forces, and without co-operation with the Communists.

An especially important platform for the joint actions of the Social-Democrats and Communists is the struggle for peace, détente and disarmament. The aggravation of international tensions, primarily caused by US policy, increasing military expenditures, escalation of the arms race, and the development of new types of mass destruction weapons all pose an enormous threat to world peace and the security of nations. Workers' parties and organisations of various political orientations are equally interested in checking mankind's movement towards a nuclear catastrophe and saving modern civilisation and life on earth.

This was once again emphasised at the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is noteworthy that the leaders of the Socialist International received the initiatives advanced by the CPSU with great interest. For the first time in the history of the Socialist International, its official organ published a part of the CPSU Central Committee's report to the Congress, viz. the section dealing with the CPSU's contacts with the social-democratic parties and the Socialist International, in which the desire was expressed to develop co-operation with

them on matters related to preventing war and strengthening peace.

The Socialist International journal also published information on the CPSU Central Committee's letter of May 14, 1981 to the Socialist International and its major parties, a letter explaining the Soviet Union's position on disarmament and other international problems and calling, among other things, for a freeze in the number of nuclear missiles in Europe.<sup>1</sup>

As subsequent developments were to show, the leaders of the Socialist International and its member parties realise that today it is impossible to secure peace and disarmament without the participation of, or, even more so, acting against the Soviet Union. For this reason in recent years top officials of social-democratic parties have made frequent visits to Moscow to meet with representatives of the CPSU. In 1981, for instance, such prominent public figures as Olof Palme, Willy Brandt and Michael Foot made visits to the USSR. In the same year, CPSU delegations were invited to attend the congresses of the British Labour Party (September 27-October 2), the Spanish Socialist Labour Party (October 21-24) and the French Socialist Party (October 23-25).

Speaking at the Moscow luncheon given in honour of Willy Brandt, Leonid Brezhnev said: "We appreciate the participation of Social-Democrats and Socialists of many countries in the struggle against the arms race and the threat of nuclear war and for strengthening peace, and are always ready to co-operate in this noble endeavour."<sup>2</sup>

Boris Ponomarev, speaking at the ceremonial session held to mark the 165th anniversary of the birth and the 100th anniversary of the death of Karl Marx, pointed out that "the CPSU develops fruitful contacts with the socialist and social-democratic, Labour parties with the view to defending detente and strengthening peaceful relations between East and West".<sup>3</sup>

Thus, notwithstanding all the difficulties and obstacles, Socialists and Social-Democrats can and do co-operate with Communists both in individual countries and in the world scene.

<sup>1</sup> See: *Socialist Affairs*, No. 4, 1981, p. 161.

<sup>2</sup> *Pravda*, July 1, 1981.

<sup>3</sup> *Pravda*, March 31, 1983.

As is proved by historical experience, changes in the objective conditions of the working people's life and struggle are of decisive importance for broadening contacts and promoting the unity of actions of the workers' parties. For these changes foster the development of the political consciousness of the masses, promote their desire for unity, and force social-democratic leaders to break off their alliance with the bourgeoisie and embark upon a road of co-operation with the Communists.

A great and increasingly important role in healing the split in the workers' movement is played (along with the objective factors) by the subjective factors, namely the purposeful and vigorous actions of the advocates of working-class unity. Moreover, it is the persistent efforts of these forces that may eventually translate the favourable objective prerequisites for the unity of actions into real and effective unity.

The advocates of unity operative within the social-democratic ranks have an important role to play in modifying policy pursued by the Socialist International and its member parties. Although they are not always free from anti-communist prejudices and not consistent and active enough in the struggle for the unity of the workers' movement, their role is highly important indeed, for they have to act within social-democratic organisations whose leaders not infrequently come out against co-operation with the Communists.

The Communists are charged with special responsibility for achieving the unity of the workers' movement. They constitute the most active and consistent force of the working class, a force actually interested in and striving for unity.

The communist parties proceed from the understanding that the existence of influential social-democratic organisations is the result of the objective conditions of the development of the workers' movement in capitalist countries in the epoch of imperialism. There exist serious economic, political, social and ideological factors which are conducive to the preservation of social-reformist tendencies in the working-class movement. Mindful of existing realities, however, the Communists see their task not in undermining, breaking down and liquidating the social-democratic organisations but in persistently working for co-operation and unity of action with them.

Of great importance for the struggle for unity of the workers'

movement is the communist parties' firm conviction that the unity of actions of the Communists and the Social-Democrats is not only essential but possible. That the unity of the workers' movement is not a utopian dream, or self-deception, but something real and quite possible is proved both by theory and by the experience accumulated in many countries.

The main thing is that the Communists and the Socialists constitute the two wings of the working-class movement. Both the Communists and the Social-Democrats in their activity draw their primary support from the working class and the working people. True, many leaders of social-democracy and the Socialist International pursue a policy of co-operation with the bourgeoisie and objectively help the forces of capitalism to remain in power. However, it would be hardly proper to regard the alliance between social-democracy and the bourgeoisie as something immutable and ever-lasting.

It goes without saying that this alliance was brought about by many factors in the development of the workers' movement in the epoch of imperialism, factors which were conducive to the emergence and consolidation of the right-wing, opportunist trend in the working class and its parties. After World War II these factors were supplemented by new ones. One should take into account, for instance, that in the context of a favourable economic situation of the 1950s and 1960s the bourgeoisie was in a position to pacify wide circles of the working people. One should also bear in mind the negative consequences for the workers' movement of the side effects of the development of state-monopoly capitalism and the scientific and technological revolution. Above all, one should not forget the effects of the cold war.

At the same time, the Communists oppose the one-sided, oversimplified perception of the nature of the social-democratic parties, their ideology and policies, and, in particular, the assertions that the ideology and policy of modern social-democracy are a peculiar version of bourgeois ideology and policy, that the social-democratic parties have ceased to be reformist workers' parties and turned into bourgeois parties. From the theoretical point of view, such allegations are in conflict with the true state of affairs since they portray such a complicated and contradictory phenomenon as social-democracy and social-reformism in

a highly simplified manner. From the political point of view, such views hamper a correct assessment of certain positive aspects and tendencies in the positions and actions of the Social-Democrats, hinder constructive dialogue between the two trends in the workers' movement, and impede a businesslike approach to the elucidation and comparison of the factors that divide and unite various organisations of the working class.

Notwithstanding the noticeable shift to the right and the emergence of certain pro-bourgeois aspects in the ideology and policy of the Social-Democrats, the social-democratic parties have not ceased to be working-class parties and continue to constitute a part of the workers' movement.

It is important to note that, as a rule, these parties have traditional ties with the workers' and trade-union movement. Moreover, in their ideological and programmatic principles, political decisions and practical steps, they base themselves on the ideas and demands which emerged in the course of the working-class movement's historical development and which today constitute an important part of the theory and practice of the workers' movement in the capitalist countries.

However, these parties have retreated from the revolutionary positions of the working class, proceeding in their activities from the reformist methods and forms of achieving socialist goals. Hence the Socialist International and the social-democratic parties constitute the reformist wing in the workers' movement.

This is not to say, however, that the social-democratic parties confine their activity solely to the framework of the working class and that they deem it their sole task to represent the interests of the workers. On the contrary, as the experience of these parties indicates, they seek to spread their operations to other social strata, including activity of white-colour workers, intellectuals, students and the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie. This certainly affects not only the composition of the parties in question, but also their ideology and policy, since the non-proletarian, petty-bourgeois and sometimes overtly bourgeois views and tendencies are thus given more prominence. On the whole, nonetheless, the social-democratic parties remain basically working-class parties.

The most effective way of overcoming the split in the working-class movement is to promote joint action of the Communists and

the Social-Democrats in fighting for the concrete demands advanced by the working people. The anti-communist prejudices current among the Social-Democrats and the sectarian views on social-democracy held by some Communists can be done away with by their joining efforts in the struggle against their common class enemy.

Constant and regular work among the masses and winning them over to the side of the advocates of unity are crucial for the attainment of the unity of actions. Experience shows that anti-communist views and sentiments can be more easily combated at the grass-roots level. No matter how important the contacts and co-operation between the Communists and individual groups of workers and Social-Democrats, they alone cannot help heal the split in the workers' movement in the developed capitalist countries. This task can be solved only through a solid unity of action between the Communists and the Socialists at the party level. For this reason, while developing co-operation with individual groups of workers and Social-Democrats the Communists focus on establishing co-operation with social-democratic parties as a whole. The Communists therefore seek to establish such contacts and co-operation with individual social-democratic groups as would not complicate the relations between the communist and the socialist parties and would not hamper the attainment of their paramount goal—the unity of the entire workers' movement.

The Communists place emphasis on all that is common to all the workers and unites them in their joint struggle. The most difficult thing in the work towards establishing co-operation between the Communists and the Socialists is to take the first step, to overcome the effects of the years of mistrust and hostility, and to embark on common action. For this reason, the communist parties emphasise that the Communists should be especially flexible in finding a common approach for tackling concrete problems. The all-or-nothing approach can only undermine the process of rapprochement.

The fact that the Communists seek co-operation with social-democratic organisations does not mean that the communist parties refrain from criticising the erroneous views advocated by the Socialists and the theory and practice of social-reformism. In this connection, special importance is attached to the problem

of the substance and form of criticism directed against the social-democratic theory and practice. The most difficult thing is to avoid creating additional and possibly insurmountable obstacles to co-operation between the Communists and the Socialists when criticising the erroneous views and approaches of right-wing Social-Democrats harmful to the cause of the working class. Experience shows that poorly substantiated, one-sided and abusive criticism can only cause damage to the working-class and communist movements.

The success of the educational work done by the Communists and the positive effects of their criticism of right-wing socialist concepts cannot be guaranteed unless they avoid sectarian and dogmatic oversimplification and offensive statements. The international communist movement concentrates on winning the Social-Democrats and their organisations to the policy of unity, rather than struggling against them. For this reason, the resolutions adopted by the communist parties reiterate that what is really needed is not accusations and bitter criticism, but a comradely, constructive analysis of social-democratic concepts and well-substantiated proof of the erroneousness of certain social-democratic ideas and their harmfulness to the cause of the working class. Criticism is needed in order to help the Social-Democrats and all the working people to gain better insight into the laws of the class struggle, into the ways and means of attaining the goals of the workers' movement, and not in order to denigrate and stigmatise the Social-Democrats and their organisations.

The Marxists set themselves the task of exposing the theoretical groundlessness and political harmfulness of some of the ideas propagated by the Social-Democrats and, at the same time, to highlight all that is common in the positions of the Communists and the Socialists, all that can be conducive to their rapprochement and unity of actions.

In their struggle for unity, as well as in their overall activity, the Communists do not pursue any special interests and goals different from those of the working class. The Communists regard co-operation not as a means of undermining the influence of other workers' parties and asserting communist "supremacy", as the right-wing social-democratic leaders try to make out, but as enhancing the strength and militancy of the entire working class, consolidating its positions and multiplying its authority

in society, promoting the class-consciousness of all the workers, and encouraging the workers' struggle both for attaining their immediate demands and for abolishing capitalist power and building socialism.

While placing special emphasis on the problem of unity, the Communists in the non-socialist countries today do not aim at creating unified proletarian parties. It goes without saying that setting up unified parties based on Marxist principles would signify a tremendous gain for the working class. However, the present context does not offer the necessary conditions for this. Therefore, the unity of actions of the working class is today understood as the unity of independent workers' political parties and organisations based on a jointly elaborated platform.

The Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe held in June 1976 declared that they supported "a constructive dialogue among all democratic forces, with all the originality and independence of these forces retained, in order to reach fruitful co-operation in the struggle for peace, security and social progress".<sup>1</sup>

Overcoming the split in the workers' movement and the establishment of co-operation between communist and socialist organisations is not an easy matter. This endeavour is likely to meet both with successes and failures. However, aware of all the difficulties and problems involved, the Communists are convinced that the drive for the unity of action is a correct and objectively necessary policy.

The principled position taken by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on this problem was reaffirmed at the 26th CPSU Congress held in February 1981. The Congress stated: "Present-day social democracy has considerable political weight. It could do more for the defence of the vital interests of the peoples and, above all, for the consolidation of peace, for improving the international situation, repulsing fascism and racism, and the offensive of reactionary forces on the political rights of the working people. In practice, however, the social-democratic leaders do not always act along these lines.

"Many of them are afflicted with the virus of anti-communism.

<sup>1</sup> *The Conference of European Communist and Workers' Parties, Berlin, June 29-30, 1976, Moscow, 1977, p. 34 (in Russian).*

Some allow themselves to be drawn into campaigns organised by imperialism against the socialist countries, and refer to the so-called Atlantic solidarity to justify the arms race. Understandably, this policy is contrary to the interests of the working people. We disapprove of it most strongly.

"But we will actively support all steps that are beneficial to peace and democracy. In view of the present complication of the international situation, we attach importance to cooperation with Social-Democrats, trade unions, religious circles, and all democratic and peace-loving forces in the matter of preventing war and strengthening peace."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1981, p. 25.*

## CONCLUSION

An analysis of the history and activity of the Socialist International shows that the leaders of Western European social-democracy have made considerable efforts to reconstruct, after World War II, the international association of social-democratic parties and to turn it into an active and influential organisation. They succeeded in bringing into the International the overwhelming majority of the socialist and social-democratic parties throughout the world, above all, those in the developed capitalist countries. Throughout the years of the Socialist International's existence its membership grew from 34 to 65 parties (as of 1981).

The Socialist International has developed into an important international social-democratic forum for exchanging opinions, co-ordinating positions and evolving a united approach to the main problems of ideology and policy.

At the same time, it should be noted that, despite a considerable growth in the membership of the International due to the incorporation of parties from non-European countries and greater attention devoted to the developing countries, the Socialist International remains primarily an organisation of the Western European social-democratic parties. These parties play a leading role in the International, formulating the basic principles of its ideology and policy. Their opinion is, as a rule, of decisive importance in forging the International's stand on various questions.

Organisationally, the most important principle of the Socialist International is that of autonomy, i.e., independence of its member parties in pursuing their policies. The International's decisions are not binding on its members. Naturally, this does not

imply that SI member parties are entitled to adhere to an ideology and policy running counter to the Socialist International's programme, and that the International has no influence at all on the activities of its member organisations. Only those parties which support the concept of democratic socialism as formulated in the SI policy-making declaration of 1951 can be its members. At the same time, the Socialist International has no right to demand that its member parties pursue a policy they do not agree with.

On the one hand, this organisational principle considerably limits the International's opportunities to implement a concerted policy and to influence the activities of individual parties. It often turns the Socialist International into an organisation which can only take note of the positions of individual parties, without being able to pursue a definite line. This undoubtedly undermines the prestige of the International, especially in cases when individual parties openly disregard its opinion and act in defiance of the resolutions it adopts.

On the other hand, this organisational principle enables the International to unite and keep within its framework parties taking different stands. It also lends the International certain flexibility, enables it to prevent overt splits and disintegration in the complicated context of growing differences, differentiation and infighting within social-democratic ranks. This principle fully corresponds to the Socialist International's desire to reconcile various tendencies and trends obtaining in social-democratic ranks, reach compromise decisions, smooth away difficulties arising in relations between individual parties, especially those between parties in the developed and the developing countries, and to adapt its policy to the constantly changing conditions under which international social-democracy has to operate.

The developments of the late 1960s and early 1970s, which promoted the differentiation within the Socialist International and the desire of individual parties to pursue policies (vis-à-vis the Communists, for instance) substantially different from the official policy of the International, led to a situation where the non-binding nature of SI resolutions sometimes recoils both on the Socialist International as a whole and on those parties which hold dominant positions in it. This forces the SI leadership to make great efforts in order to prevent a further retreat of its



members from a concerted policy, to check the differentiation and polarisation of forces, to maintain the unity of social-democratic parties and their co-operation in the international arena.

In this context, in some Western European social-democratic parties, voices are heard which urge greater unity and co-ordination of the activity of SI parties, condemn "nationalist tendencies", and stress the importance of the solidarity and "international unity" of all the SI members.

An important step towards achieving unity was the 1976 election of Willy Brandt as Chairman of the Socialist International. This was not a routine change of leadership, but a serious political step designed to make use of the international prestige, experience and ability of an outstanding leader of contemporary social-democracy in a bid to overcome the difficulties experienced by the Socialist International, enhance its prestige and influence throughout the world, and lend its activity greater purposefulness and effectiveness.

However, as numerous facts testify, this did not help the Socialist International to overcome its organisational weaknesses. Speaking at the 15th SI Congress in 1980, Willy Brandt was again compelled to raise this question. He said: "The various parties' independent policies cannot be called into question by any resolutions adopted by the International. . . But it is of course welcome if the deliberations held within the framework of the International are matched by parallel attitudes on the part of the participating parties. . . . There exists a great need for consultation and for exchange—and, in many areas, a coordination in substance. Moreover, this need is expanding."<sup>1</sup>

Even more important than the organisational weaknesses of the Socialist International are the contradictoriness and inconsistency of its ideology and policy. Quite often the decisions and the practical activity of the International and its member parties failed to meet the urgent requirements of the workers' and national liberation movements.

An analysis of the Socialist International's activity shows that its potential for achieving the declared goals are considerable enough. Nonetheless, the International's activity in the 1950s and 1960s did more harm than good to the workers' and democratic movements.

<sup>1</sup> *Socialist Affairs*, No. 1, 1981, p. 7.

The Socialist International has not participated in organising any international events and practical measures intended to assist the working class and the broad masses in their struggle against the bourgeois and capitalist domination in various countries. The powerful upsurge of the working people's struggle for their demands in France, Italy, Japan, Britain and other countries remained outside the field of the International's view.

The Socialist International proved to be unprepared to tackle the problems of the national liberation movement and to provide meaningful aid to any one of the peoples fighting for their liberation.

While advancing the slogans of peace and international security, the Socialist International and its member parties were, in fact, of great help to the imperialist forces of the United States and Western Europe in enacting their plans to intensify the arms race, set up military blocs and create US bases on foreign territories.

The main reasons behind this kind of behaviour are serious contradictions between the SI principles and the practical activity of the social-democratic leaders, as well as the fact that, affected as they are by anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda, Western European social-democratic leaders became involved in and contributed a lot to the anti-Soviet campaign, forgetting the grave lessons of World War II and turning into accomplices of the right-wing, conservative forces active in the capitalist countries.

In the 1970s, the positions of the International and its member parties were considerably modified under the impact of changes occurring in the individual capitalist countries and in the world as a whole. This is evidenced by a certain shift to the left in their ideological posture, the emergence of positive tendencies in certain areas of their foreign policy, by certain changes in their approach to the national liberation movement and the problems facing the developing countries, and the efforts of certain social-democratic parties to enter into co-operation with the Communists.

All this testifies to positive shifts within the Socialist International and a tendency towards restoring the political and ideological independence of social-democracy.

At the same time, the Socialist International and its member

parties continue to adhere to the doctrine of democratic socialism which, though proclaiming socialism its goal, cannot lead the working class and the masses beyond the confines of the capitalist system, cannot help to eliminate the domination of private capital and build a truly socialist society. The policy of reformism and class co-operation, the rejection of revolutionary methods of transforming society, the defence of bourgeois democracy and the bourgeois state all serve as obstacles to the struggle of the working people for restructuring society along socialist lines.

The positions taken by the Socialist International and its leading parties on problems of foreign policy and international relations remain largely inconsistent and contradictory. While calling for peace, detente and disarmament, many social-democratic leaders support the main trends in US and NATO foreign policy which are at variance with the quest for peace and disarmament. Some of the leaders of the Socialist International continue to view international problems in the light of anti-Soviet policies. They support the imperialist mass media's inventions about the alleged Soviet military threat and calls for rearmament and modernisation of the Western armies, for a close alliance with the United States, and the like.

The Socialist International adopted quite a few statements and resolutions supporting the developing countries' demands to restructure the entire system of international economic relations inherited from the colonial past and to establish a new international economic order. However, the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America would like the Western European Social-Democrats to supplement good resolutions with practical steps conducive to the satisfaction of the legitimate demands of the developing countries and to the actual restructuring of the existing trade, financial and other economic relations in the interest of the developing countries.

The contradictory and inconsistent nature of the Socialist International's and its parties' ideology and policy provoke acute controversy among various forces and trends within the social-democratic ranks. There occur serious conflicts between the Western European members of the International and the non-European, primarily Latin American, SI parties. There are also increasing differences on a wide range of problems between the

socialist and the social-democratic parties in Western Europe itself. Moreover, there are sharp clashes within social-democratic ranks in individual countries.

The processes of differentiation and the appearance of conflicting tendencies in the Socialist International make one wonder about the effect of these phenomena on the activity of the International.

We believe that in assessing these phenomena one should avoid either overestimating or underestimating the importance of the differentiation mentioned above. We feel that it would be wrong to conclude, proceeding from the contradictions and stratification now observed in the Socialist International, that the international social-democratic movement has already broken up (or is soon going to break up) into separate, disconnected parties and groups and will cease to play a role of any consequence in the life of individual countries and in the world arena. In our view, social-democracy, notwithstanding the apparent difficulties which confront it, will remain an influential force in the workers' and democratic movement both in individual capitalist countries and in the world as a whole.

At the same time, it would be a mistake to take no notice of the struggle which is now unfolding in the Socialist International and leading to the consolidation of those left-wing forces and groups which call in question the correctness of the ideological and political principles of social-democracy and advance more radical programmes for the struggle waged by the workers' movement.

The differentiation within the Socialist International is not an accidental, transient phenomenon. It reflects the deep-rooted, permanent contradictions inherent in social-democracy and the effect of its two main conflicting trends, the petty-bourgeois and the proletarian. The effect of various tendencies is determined by many factors, among them socio-economic conditions obtaining in individual countries, historical traditions and national specifics in the development of the workers' movement, the influence of the bourgeoisie and its parties, the scope of the class struggle, the influence and activity of the communist parties. It also largely depends on the personal qualities of the leaders, their ties with the working people, on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie, on the other.

For all the diversity and contradictoriness of the phenomena in question, the 1970s were on the whole marked by an unmistakable shift to the left in the positions of a number of social-democratic parties and of the Socialist International as a whole which was brought about by the consolidation of the left-wing forces and the leftist leanings.

In what direction will international social-democracy develop in the future and what forces will prevail in the Socialist International?

These questions will be answered in the course of the struggle which is now unfolding and will continue in the future within the social-democratic ranks. It stands to reason that the consolidation of the left and the positive changes within the International and its parties will be hindered by many objective and subjective factors. The monopoly bourgeoisie, the petty-bourgeois social strata, the politically backward groups of workers, the right-wing Socialists, the ultra-left and the sectarians in the workers' movement and many other elements are bound to exert a negative influence on social-democracy. Mindful of these and other circumstances one cannot expect the Socialist International and its parties to break off with the ideology and policy of social reformism and take a revolutionary stand. In the foreseeable future, the Socialist International and its major parties are likely to remain loyal to the social-reformist theory and practice and to the concept of "democratic socialism".

But, at the same time, one should take into account the existence of certain other factors which influence the social-democratic movement and which will lead to positive shifts in the policy of social-democratic organisations. As an analysis of the Socialist International's history shows, of decisive importance for fostering positive tendencies in its policies are changes in the objective conditions of the life and struggle of the working class and other segments of the working people, such as the exacerbation of capitalist contradictions, the weakening of the monopoly bourgeoisie's positions, the intensification of class struggle, the consolidation of the left forces and tendencies in the workers' movement, the successes scored by the countries of victorious socialism, the relaxation of international tensions, the consolidation of the principles of peaceful co-existence between the states of the two socio-political systems, the growth of the national and

social liberation forces in the developing countries, and the growing power and authority of the communist movement.

It stands to reason, however, that objective prerequisites alone are insufficient. In order to overcome the negative tendencies in the activity of the Socialist International and its parties and to bridge the gap between words and deeds, all left-wing forces in the workers' movement must also make vigorous efforts.

The capitalist world has entered into a new stage of its development: the period of relatively favourable economic conditions, marked by a substantial growth in production, the absence of mass unemployment and a certain rise in the living standard of certain categories of the working people, has ended, and a new period, characterised by economic difficulties, recession, unprecedented inflation, soaring unemployment and the monopolies' offensive on the well-being and rights of the workers, has started. The workers' discontent with their position is growing and fostering their struggle for their interests and for radical changes in society.

All this creates favourable conditions for the consolidation of the left-wing forces and class tendencies in the workers' movement in capitalist countries. This will undoubtedly influence the Socialist International, compelling it to devote more attention to defending the interests of the workers and encouraging their struggle against the sway of the monopolies and reactionary forces.

Last but not least, the early 1980s saw the aggravation of international tensions, the beginning of a new round in the arms race, and the stirring up of the aggressive forces in the United States and some other countries of the West. The fruits obtained by detente in the 1970s are endangered. This causes the legitimate concern of the peoples throughout the world, stimulates an unprecedented upsurge of the anti-war movement in Western Europe and encourages the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America to offer greater resistance to imperialism.

The new situation requires that the Socialist International define its positions in a more clear-cut manner. Obviously, it will only be able to maintain and enhance its prestige and influence in the world if it intensifies its struggle against the attempts by the US leadership to return the world to the cold war days and consistently supports the forces of peace and social progress.

*Supplement*

**THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL  
AND THE PRESENT DAY:  
THE MONTECHORO CONGRESS<sup>1</sup>**

Much of Prof. Sibilev's book is based on his first-hand impressions of the seven social-democratic forums he attended. By no means do I intend either to stand aloof from his assessments and descriptions or to fully subscribe to the author's opinion on all issues he considers in his most interesting study, based on vast factual material. We offer the reader this supplement with the view to sharing our interpretation of the results of the latest, 16th Congress of the Socialist International held in Portugal on April 4-10, 1983.

In certain respects, this Congress constituted a landmark in the history of the Socialist International, and this for a number of reasons.

First, it was held at a crucial point in mankind's postwar history, in the year that is going to be pivotal or even decisive from the point of view of struggle against the new round in the arms race threatening the world. The Congress has largely succeeded in attracting the attention of the socialist and social-democratic parties to the problems involved in the arms race.

<sup>1</sup> Since the book by Prof. Nikolai Sibilev had been written before the 16th Congress of the Socialist International held in Montechoro (Portugal) in April 1983 and the author of the book is now away from the Soviet Union on a long business trip, Progress Publishers, on consultation with Prof. Sibilev, thought it necessary to add a supplement to the book. It is by Yuri Zhilin, a well-known Soviet expert in contemporary problems of international social-democracy. Since 1961 he has attended six SI congresses, as well as the 1971 Helsinki session of the SI Council, as a *Pravda* correspondent.

Second, of no less importance is the very attempt to try to provide an answer to the most pressing questions of today on behalf of a sizable, although reformist, contingent of the international working-class movement, which undoubtedly has an important role to play on the political scene. According to Socialist International official statistics, on the eve of the 16th Congress the membership of the parties enjoying the status of Socialist International full members totalled 16 million; more than 100 million voters supported them at elections.

Third, the documents adopted by the Congress are illustrative of an interesting evolution of the stand taken by a large number of SI member parties both on foreign-policy problems and the crisis ravaging the capitalist world.

An analysis of the deliberations and the results of the Montechoro Congress does not permit their assessment in simple terms. Rather, this assessment should be based on recognition of the contradictory nature of the Socialist International's stand on all cardinal issues and, at the same time, the above-mentioned evolution, which sometimes takes quite a positive direction.

A major step in developing the CPSU's policy vis-à-vis international social-democracy, as charted by the 26th CPSU Congress, has been signalled by the message of the CPSU Central Committee addressed to the 16th Congress of the Socialist International. The message urges the working-class democratic movement associated with the Socialist International to enhance its contribution to the cause of saving humanity from a nuclear catastrophe. This appeal has been dictated by the CPSU's concern over the state of international relations clouded by the war danger.

The problems of international security, peace and disarmament increasingly attract the attention of the social-democratic movement. These problems are of great concern for the entire world public.

What was the Socialist International's response to the message from the CPSU?

In answering this question one should recall a statement made by Willy Brandt, Chairman of the Socialist International and the head of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. As he said at a press conference, the letter from the CPSU Central Com-

mittee was made known to all the delegations attending the Congress. He noted that the Congress had also received a message from US "official circles". (It is noteworthy that by the time this book is out this latter message has not been published and therefore is not known to the international public.) A general response to these messages, according to Brandt, is contained in the resolutions adopted by the Congress and "reflects both concurrence of and differences in opinions". As is obvious, the SI Chairman takes a balanced approach to the messages in question and, in point of fact, refers the public to the Congress documents, which certainly deserve a close study.

What do the Congress documents say about the most urgent problem of today, that of averting the thermonuclear conflict? "Nuclear disarmament concerns every man, woman and child on the face of the earth... The issue is human survival."<sup>1</sup> This can hardly be called in question. The thing is, however, that the task is referred to the two "superpowers", the United States and the USSR. One would not argue against this if it implied the special responsibility of the two states for ensuring international security. However, what is actually implied is that practically all the major problems of war and peace facing the world today are considered to be the result of the rivalry between the USSR and the USA. This approach fully ignores the essential difference between the Soviet and the US foreign policies. However, the possibility of preserving peace and finding practical solutions to the problems of curbing the arms race, effecting disarmament and preventing humanity from sliding into a nuclear disaster depends exactly on the essence and the concrete implementation of this or that political line on the international scene.

It is well known that the Socialist International avoids recognising the existence of two lines in world politics. There is nothing new about that. In this context, it would be useful to examine the concrete demands the social-democratic parties make, appealing simultaneously to the United States and the Soviet Union. "They must agree to cease any further escalation of the arms race and to begin to dismantle the existing, precarious balance of terror. Then, obviously, other countries, most notably powers

<sup>1</sup> The quotations are from the original materials issued by the 16th Congress of the Socialist International.

with nuclear weapons—China, France and the United Kingdom—must participate in these negotiations..." In fact, this is exactly what the Soviet Union wants.

Elsewhere the Socialist International says: "...there are profoundly disturbing signs of the possibility that there could be a new, and aggravated, phase in the arms race as it extends into the heavens and utilizes more and more sophisticated weapons." However, the delegates of the Socialist International, just as the international public, know only too well who is making plans for a war in and from outer space. It is the US Administration. As for the Soviet Union, it proposes a ban on the deployment of any kind of weapon in outer space.

The Congress called on the Soviet Union and the United States to take immediate steps to prevent a further escalation of the arms race. These steps should include agreements on the first practical measures in the talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms, in the talks on intermediate-range nuclear weapons in Europe, in the Vienna talks, as well as an agreement in Madrid on holding a European disarmament conference. This call is in harmony with the Soviet Union's foreign-policy course and its clear proposals on this set of issues.

Further it says that "the two super-powers should also agree on a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests and the production of chemical and biological weapons and should show restraint in arms trade and transfers." It is just at this that the Soviet Union's concrete proposals are aimed. At the same time, it is well known who is responsible for suspending the negotiations or has rejected an agreement on these issues. Again, it is the US Administration. The Congress delegates declared: "We support a negotiated, general, verifiable, mutual freeze on nuclear weapons." Who does not support this? It is the present US Administration.

The Congress called for "an open, unambiguous Soviet-American rejection of all strategies for limited nuclear war..." However, it is well known that the concept of such a war has been formulated by the US Administration and totally renounced by the Soviet Union as an extremely dangerous one.

The Congress called on the Soviet Union and the United States "to curtail and dismantle all new military technologies that threaten to further destabilize the balance of terror." As is known, the Soviet Union proposes a concrete agreement on stopping the

production of new types of weapons of mass destruction. However, the US Administration opposes such a measure.

Let us now consider the Congress's call for "a reiteration by both powers of their obligations under the 1972 Treaty Limiting Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, American ratification of SALT II; an agreement on a permanent treaty banning all nuclear weapons tests; a ban on the production, stockpiling and use of chemical and biological weapons; the demilitarization of the sea-bed and outer space." All these appeals, with only one exception, are addressed to the two "superpowers". In point of fact, all of them should be addressed to the United States only.

Now, consider the political intentions formulated by the Socialist International: "We want to encourage the proposals put forward in the United Nations for nuclear-free zones in Asia, Africa, the South Pacific and the Middle East. We also endorse the notion of a zone free of both battle-field nuclear and chemical weapons put forward by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues under the leadership of Olof Palme." The Congress welcomed the efforts to set up nuclear-free zones in Northern Europe and in the Balkans. The Soviet Union, too, welcomes them. They are not welcomed only by the United States and its NATO allies.

To sum up, one could say that to urge Moscow to give a positive answer to all these questions is tantamount to trying to force an open door. There are doors on which one should knock, and knock loudly, since they are shut in the face of all demands of the international public. These are the doors of the White House.

There is a problem that deserves special emphasis. The message of the CPSU Central Committee to the Congress of the Socialist International points out that the time left for the solution of the problems of disarmament and security is limited and is quickly elapsing. For its part, the 16th Congress of the Socialist International stated that there is little time left for the participants in the relevant talks and that mankind's security is jeopardised by every new round of the nuclear and non-nuclear arms race. Here, a full coincidence of views is observed. The message of the CPSU Central Committee stressed: "Of key significance today is the question of how to avoid a fresh round of the nuclear missile race in Europe." For its part, the Congress of the Social-

ist International pointed out: "The INF talks in Geneva during the coming few months are of crucial importance to the whole international, political and military development. Hence, if the time does not allow final results, the Soviet Union and the United States should speedily conclude an interim agreement consisting of balanced mutual commitments without destabilizing actions." This highly ambiguous stand may be interpreted in various ways. There is, in fact, only one thing that can destabilise the situation in Europe: initiating the deployment of new US missiles.

Various social-democratic parties in NATO countries repeatedly voice their "loyalty to Atlantic solidarity". However, their concrete positions increasingly resound with the growing awareness of national responsibility and humanity's concern over the fate of civilisation and life on Earth, with the implicit or explicit realisation of the fact that "the threat to Europe" comes not from the East, but from the opposite direction, that it is implicit in the US Administration's intention to turn the European continent into a theatre of war. Not everybody speaks about this. However, there is every reason to suppose that many think this way. Moreover, there are symptoms indicating that the once vociferous social-democratic advocates of the notorious "double-track decision" proposed by the United States and NATO are beginning to realise its real and dangerous implications. The policy pursued by the Reagan Administration and its response to Soviet peace initiatives is an eye-opener.

Unfortunately, some people in the Socialist International still refuse to see things in their true light. This has been testified to by the conduct of the representatives of the French Socialist Party at the Congress. They were the only ones to abstain from voting for the item of the resolution denouncing "destabilising action". The French delegation took the most pro-American (not merely pro-Atlantic) position among all the socialist and social-democratic parties. They spoke a lot about France's security but showed little understanding of the fact that their country's interests would be undermined by a destabilised situation in Europe which may be brought about by the possible implementation of US plans.

It should be noted that some parties, which have been traditionally ranked among the Socialist International's left-wingers, are at present to the right of the social-democrats and the Labo-



urites in Northern and Central Europe in their approach to the struggle against the war danger. On this issue any deviation from the truth, be it to the right or to the left, is especially dangerous.

The present leader of the Italian Socialist Party, Bettino Craxi, was indulging in falsehood when, speaking at the Congress, he claimed that the Soviet Union was deploying its missiles "every week of every month". He urged the Soviet Union to advance "new, concrete and positive" proposals, as if he was ignorant of the numerous Soviet proposals concerning medium-range nuclear missiles. It is not the Soviet Union, but the ISP that has not advanced any proposals of its own on the issue in question. It only repeats what has been said by the United States. The only thing of its own that it has to offer is the territory of Italy, which the ISP leaders have offered for the deployment of US missiles. One should be devoid of any feeling of reality and national responsibility to maintain that this could provide for the security of Italy or Western Europe as a whole.

To do justice to Bettino Craxi, we should quote another part of his speech, addressed to President Reagan: "Denunciation of the 'empire of evil' sounds repulsive to us. It evokes the medieval spirit of crusades; it may serve the most obscurant fanaticism but not the reasonable effort to comprehend the actual reality of the world. . . . To resign oneself to the Manichean idea according to which the world is inexorably divided into the empire of evil and the empire of good is to depart, in a definitive and dangerous manner, from the road of peaceful solutions, the reduction of antagonisms and the search for new ways of coexistence and collaboration, and to head for a most somber future."

It is well known that the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries are prepared to consider any constructive proposal aimed at solving the urgent problems of international life provided the principles of equality and equal security are observed.

The SI Congress considered the problems involved in the existence of conflict situations in many regions of the world.

The resolution on the Middle East condemns the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the atrocities committed in Sabra and Shatila. However, it passes over in silence the role the US Administration plays as an accomplice of the Begin Government. As has been recorded, many parties and organisations of the Social-

ist International recognise the PLO as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Some others, although they do not publicly recognise the PLO's right to act as such, maintain political relations with it on a regular basis. On the whole, however, the Socialist International, while standing up for direct contacts among the "legitimate representatives" of the Palestinian people, Jordan, and Israel, avoided defining its position on this problem. If not the PLO, who is then the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people? The real cause of the ambiguous SI position on the Middle East settlement is that six months before the Congress many of the SI leaders had expressed their support for Reagan's Middle East plan. This plan practically denies the Palestinians the right to create a state of their own. It has nothing in common with the proposals advanced by the Arab states. Nonetheless, the leader of the Socialist Party of Portugal Mario Soares, for instance, believes it to be realistic.

In its documents the Socialist International ignores the relevant Soviet proposals supported by the majority of Arab states. Thus, while it would be incorrect to describe the present Socialist International's position as fully pro-Israeli in form (unlike its previous position), one still cannot describe it as a just and realistic one in the essence because it is aimed at finding a solution which is certain to run counter to the basic interests of the Arab peoples. This cannot result in a reasonable political settlement of the Middle East problem.

The resolutions of the Congress on the situation in Latin America and in the Caribbean condemn the policy of the present US Administration. They not only denounce the military and oligarchical regimes in Guatemala, El Salvador, Haiti, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay and other countries of the continent but also point out that "the policies of the Reagan administration in the economic, military and political fields have seriously aggravated an already difficult and dangerous situation" in Central America. They "firmly oppose and reject all the attempts made by U.S. agencies to destabilize" Nicaragua and Grenada. It is pointed out that "the Reagan Administration has interpreted revolutionary movements with profound roots in popular struggles against oligarchic and terrorist oppression as agents of Soviet, or Cuban, conspiracy." It is also noted that "this view radically distorts the reality of the area."

The Congress resolutions condemn the South African regime's aggressive actions against Namibia, Angola, Mozambique, Lesotho, Zimbabwe and Zambia. The Socialist International formulated its position on the ways to secure "national sovereignty and social justice" in Southern Africa:

"1. Increased economic assistance to the front-line states....

"2. Political and material support to the liberation movements, to independent trade unions, and to the victims of apartheid in South Africa and Namibia. The Socialist International reaffirms that Namibia, a country illegally occupied by South Africa in violation of all international law, has the right to its independence and the Namibian people to their freedom.

"3. Binding U.N. economic sanctions against South Africa. Awaiting such a decision in the UN, each nation should apply policies to stop new investments, close all loopholes of the binding UN arms embargo, and reduce contacts with the apartheid regime in the areas of culture...

"4. Increase solidarity work with the people of Namibia and South Africa in our own countries."

While these positions are shared by a number of Socialist International parties, one should not ignore the fact that the socialist-led French government has increased France's trade with the RSA and continues to help its racist regime to build a nuclear potential.

At the same time, one should note that the Congress resolutions distort the situation in Afghanistan and around it. They ignore the fact that an undeclared war has been unleashed from outside against the legitimate government of Afghanistan. They pass over in silence the well-known facts that it is with the money of US special agencies that mercenary gangs are formed in countries neighbouring Afghanistan; that these gangs are armed with US weapons, including chemical ones, before being sent to Afghanistan; that among the bandits' victims are civilians—peasants, workers, teachers, clergymen—all those who are loyal to the people's government. The Congress documents say nothing about the constructive, businesslike proposals of the Afghan government aimed at facilitating the settlement of the situation around Afghanistan.

One cannot fail to be puzzled by the references to the "presence" of Soviet troops in Ethiopia. This simply has nothing to

do with reality. It is not to the Socialist International's credit, either, to exploit, for purely propaganda purposes, the situation obtaining in Poland. One could cite other examples of the basic differences in the political assessments and conclusions made by the Socialist International and the CPSU.

There is one more point to make—rather ideological than political by nature. The Congress was held under the motto "The World in Crisis—the Socialist Response". Were there any changes in the social-democratic stand on this matter? If there is something new about it, it is, to all appearances, concentrated in the passage of the Congress final document which states that the postwar period was marked by the spread of "euphoric illusions about a transformed capitalism, idylls of an endless growth.... On the right, the Thatchers and Reagans and worse, the Pinochets, react by trying to dismantle the social gains of half a century of popular struggle". It is a rather frank and resolute assessment especially if we compare it to some of the former illusions shared by the Socialist International parties only a short while ago.

What has remained unchanged is the attempt to portray some of the economic difficulties experienced by the socialist countries as a crisis of their social system.

That the attempt to equate absolutely incomparable phenomena is completely unwarranted can be seen even from quotations from a Congress resolution: "...economic crisis in half a century has widened the gap between the rich and poor nations and thrown more than forty million men and women out of work in Europe and North America... In the advanced Western economies there have been ten years of reduced growth, runaway inflation and growing unemployment, monetary instability and wasteful speculation." Socialism does not know the decline and degradation of the kind described above. These phenomena are inherent only in the capitalist system.

Statistics provides ample evidence of the groundlessness of the SI ideologists' attempts to describe the situation obtaining both in the capitalist and the socialist parts of the world as "the world crisis": in the 1970s the rate of growth of national income and industrial production registered in the CMEA countries was nearly twice that on the industrialised capitalist countries. In 1981 and 1982 the Soviet national income grew by 5.3 per cent (in

comparable prices), while the volume of industrial production increased by 6.3 per cent. In the same period, some of the capitalist countries did not register any growth in industrial production at all. In the first quarter of 1983, industrial production in the Soviet Union grew by 4.7 per cent as compared with the first quarter of 1982 (in 1982 it increased by 2.1 per cent). The productivity of labour increased by 3.9 per cent (in the first quarter of 1982 it increased by 1.5 per cent).

The allegations contained in the resolution about the chronic crisis ravaging the socialist countries' agriculture are equally false. Over the last fifteen years, the average annual production of grain in the USSR increased by 75 million tons, or by 58 per cent, while the production of meat rose by 5.5 million tons, or by 70 per cent (and that with the population growth of 15 per cent). Since 1965, the per capital consumption of meat and meat products has increased by 41 per cent while the consumption of milk and dairy products has grown by 25 per cent.

We do not mean to deny that economic difficulties do exist. The Soviet Party and government bodies concentrate their efforts on overcoming them. The above statistics clearly disprove the allegations about a crisis or stagnation in the socialist economic system and testify to the groundlessness of any attempts to picture the dynamics of economic growth under socialism and under capitalism as identical.

The most important thing is that the socialist countries have every opportunity to overcome the existing difficulties, which are always openly discussed: the objective reserves and prerequisites inherent in the social system, the clear-cut Party and Government policy aimed, among other things, at finding ways of coping with the existing economic problems and the working masses support for this policy. This cannot be said about the capitalist world, however.

The Socialist International still claims the role of a "third force" in socio-political development. Hence its conclusion: "the socialist [i.e., socialist-democratic—Y.Zh.] ideology is the only one that can bring hope to the peoples of the Third World as well as to those of the industrialized nations." Neither the past experience nor the present practices substantiate such a conclusion.

The set of measures proposed by the Congress for leading the

capitalist world out of the crisis is, in fact, a set of good intentions which are not supplemented by any proposals on effective means and ways of carrying them out and which are impossible without radical social change. In essence, reformist ideology confines economic and social policy to the capitalist system. Willy Brandt was closer to the truth than the general conclusion of the Congress, when he said: "I doubt whether, in fact, we possess the answer to the world crisis; and in particular, to that part of it inherent in the economy."

The general conclusion to be drawn from the results of the 16th Congress of the Socialist International corroborates the fundamental assessment made by the CPSU. Firstly, there is a profound difference between the ideological positions taken by the social-democratic movement, on the one hand, and the communist movement, on the other hand. Secondly, both movements are genuinely concerned over the world situation; their views on many issues involved in the struggle to stop the arms race and ensure international security are similar and sometimes fully coincide. Positive experience has been accumulated in maintaining a serious and responsible dialogue between the Communists and the Social-Democrats on the question of promoting the cause of peace, with due regard for each other's complete independence.

Today, at a crucial point in the development of the world situation, the preparedness for continuing such a dialogue and, which is even more important, for enhancing the effectiveness of action on concrete issues of international security and stopping the arms race cannot be overestimated.

Y. Zhilin